







Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation



The Theosophical Society, as such, is not responsible for any opinion or declaration in this magazine, by whomsoever expressed, unless contained in an official document.

CONCERNING "CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM."

DURING the last few months, some of us have had a great many opportunities to study Socialism at close range. Not only have we gone to many meetings where Socialist orators hold forth, but the meetings have returned the compliment, and come to us, pursuing us even to Church, and declaiming to us from the steps of the altar. We may say, therefore, that we have some understanding of the aims and ideals of contemporary Socialism, and the personalities of contemporary Socialists; that we have mastered their views and theories, so far as they understand them themselves. We are, no doubt, duly grateful for this privilege. It is always a privilege to be brought into more friendly and sincere relation with one's fellow-men, and it is our profession that we shall always be ready to hear, to give our neighbor the first word, to offer him every opportunity to declare his views, even though we differ from them wholly; and that this difference shall in no way create a barrier between us, or stand in the way of a cordial personal relation. We have, therefore, fairly earned the right to hold and express our own views concerning this at present much canvassed subject, with perfect frankness and sincerity.

And no doubt we have formed very clear views regarding Socialism, especially as a moral or religious ideal; for it claims to be both. But most of all, perhaps we have been impressed by the process of thought, the state of mind, of the Socialists themselves and their most eloquent leaders. That state of mind, it appears to us, is essentially dogmatic. They have got their dogma from one source or another, and they are bent on forcing it on every one about them. In season and out of season, with pertinence and without pertinence, they bid us enroll ourselves under the red flag and "vote the Socialist ticket." They are essentially dogmatic in another way: they see only the facts that fit their dogma, and are

142065-
29/3/17.

happily blind to everything that might controvert it; or, in case of need, they adapt the facts to the dogma, and then quote them daringly in proof. Let us give a few examples.

Our Socialist orators have harped with exceeding vehemence on one string: that Capitalism is the fount and source of all social evils; that the Capitalist is the real foe of the human race. And by Capitalism they mean what Karl Marx means: a condition of things which, superseding feudalism, has had a preponderant force only during the last fifty or a hundred years. Yet they do not scruple to attribute to Capitalism evils which existed five hundred, or even five thousand years ago; evils which are as old as the human race itself. Once more, we have had our attention directed with fervent zeal to the condition of the New York tenements and the East Side sweat-shops, as characteristic evils of Capitalism. But of course the truth is, that these things are characteristic rather of the absence of Capitalism in the large sense; the conditions really characteristic of the Capitalistic régime are Mr. Cadbury's Garden City, or the model accommodations of the National Cash Register Company, at Dayton, Ohio. For enlightened Capitalism, even where all the more humane motives are left out, has realized the fact that the happier the workman, the better his work. The workers in the sweat-shops are characteristic, not of Capitalism, but of its absence. They are, for the most part, newcomers, who do not speak our language; who have not adapted themselves to our conditions, and who are thus almost helpless on their first arrival. They are in the position, not of the well cared for workers of developed Capitalism, but of the medieval apprentice, who was paid a mere pittance, or not paid at all, until he had mastered his trade and served his time.

Again, we have been told, and told with vehement fervor, that "the monopoly of land is the tap-root of the social evil." This was said to an American audience, and as a criticism of American conditions. Now let us look at the facts. It is quite true that, in certain countries in Europe, there is an effective monopoly in land; in Germany, for instance, or in England. And this monopoly rests on armed force. In England, it goes back to the victory of William the Conqueror, who, after Hastings, assumed the ownership of the land of England, and apportioned broad estates to his victorious officers. In Austria, there is also a monopoly in land to a considerable degree; that is, the land is owned by comparatively few families, by a tenure founded on feudalism. And the same thing is true of Italy and Spain. In other parts of Europe, there is a great deal of peasant proprietorship, as in France, or of communal land ownership, as in Russia, or the Balkan peninsula.

BP
500
T46
v. 6

Outside Europe, no effective monopoly in land exists. There are landed estates in India, it is true; but there are also immense areas under peasant ownership, or communal ownership; and the same thing is true of the greater part of Asia. As to Africa, tribal ownership is the predominant condition, and this is in effect communism. Now let us come to the United States. So far from there being any land monopoly here, there is, on the contrary, the largest individual ownership that the world has ever seen. The land of the United States is divided into about six million farms, averaging about a hundred and fifty acres each; the majority of these are owned by their occupiers; and in only seven hundred thousand cases, or about one farm in nine, is a cash rent paid by the farmer. We have, therefore, in the United States, the greatest popular ownership of land the world have ever seen, some five million farmers owning their land in part or altogether, the latter immensely predominating. If we say that these five million families have, on the average, four or five members, this makes a population of from twenty to twenty-five millions owning the land and living on the land, and surely it is straining a point to speak of this as monopoly.

Our Socialist orators also inform us that the Capitalists have monopolized all the natural resources of the earth, and that they are thus able to turn the rest of us into slaves. But these same orators persistently forget the one great and substantial source of production, on which all the rest stands, and which could stand very well without all the rest. They speak as if the factory were the central point of our system. In reality, the central fact is the earth; the food products of the earth are the one great and indispensable stream of production, upon which the whole social state floats. And the fruits of the earth, in the United States, come precisely from the five or six million small farms, which are in no sense owned by Trusts, and which are not in the slightest danger of being owned by Trusts. Their produce is valued at something like five billion dollars yearly; hardly a trifle that we can afford to ignore. Yet our orators did persistently ignore it. This was the unwelcome fact which remained obligingly invisible to them.

We have heard also the argument from miracles. We have been told that the real purpose of Socialism is the culture of the soul, though the soul has, by some of them, been located in the æsophagus. And we have been told that once the bodies of the people are well cared for, well fed and clothed, they will fairly blossom out into virtue and soul-culture. And within a few minutes we are told, by the very same orators, that the rich are full of wickedness and all corruption, in spite of the fact that they are well clothed and abundantly fed. Somehow, exactly the same conditions are to have exactly the opposite effect on "the people."

In the same strain we are told that the poor drink to forget their misery, spending a hundred million dollars a year to this end, in New York City alone. Surely with that sum they might cure some of their misery, were they so inclined. But we are told that once their conditions are better, they will cease to drink. And then we are invited to regard the spectacle of the iniquitous rich, swollen with insolence and wine! Surely this is to invoke miracles!

The argument from prophecy does not lag behind. On a Sunday evening, toward the close of May, we listened to a Socialistic eschatologist. He told us, with a quiet manner that was singularly refreshing, that we were not merely on the brink of calamity, but that calamity was already upon us. Humanity was stale-mated. Our inventions were our undoing. We had produced so much that things had come to a standstill, and the depression of last winter was the result of this over-production and the beginning of the end. This good orator, who has published several books on economics, then gave a concrete instance. He said that there would be no more railroad building; that there was no more room for railroads; that we had already got too many and were up against a dead wall. We admit that we were struck by this argument; so impressed, that we went and looked up the facts. At first, we found some corroboration of our orator. In England, with less than sixty thousand square miles of surface, we found there were some sixteen thousand miles of railways, say one mile of railway to every four square miles of territory. That seemed a good deal; and the fact that only some two hundred miles of railway are built in England yearly goes to show that there, at least, railroad building is close to its natural limit. So we can take England as the standard of a country pretty well complete in its railroad outfit.

Let us now apply our standard. The United States, with dependencies, has about four million square miles of surface—we are taking round figures. On the English scale, this would call for a million miles of railroads. The United States has at present two hundred thousand, leaving eight hundred thousand yet to build before the English standard is reached. If we say that it has taken fifty years to build the existing American railroads, which is under the truth, it should take four times as long, or two hundred years, to complete our equipment. Yet we were gravely told that we were already at the end, fallen into the sere, the yellow leaf. That is the argument from prophecy, at its best.

But why should we confine railroads to the United States? There are great spaces of Europe sparsely supplied; there is Asia, which, with the exception of India and the Siberian line, is practically without railroads. There is also Africa; there are huge areas of Australia; there is South

America. The entire land surface of the world is, perhaps, fifty million square miles. At the same rate as in England, this would call for over twelve million miles of railroads. At present, taking the whole world, there are some four hundred thousand miles. If we say that this has taken fifty years to build, it will take fifteen centuries to supply the rest of the earth at the same rate. And yet we are told that, after fifty years, we are already at the end. Surely this deft use of facts should fill us with admiration.

But the matter becomes far graver when these dogmatists tell us, and tell us with fervent zeal, that their doctrine is the doctrine of the New Testament, the teaching of the apostles, the message of Jesus himself. Here we must emphatically protest. The Marxian ideal, the true Socialist paradise, is quite intelligible. They promise that, when their millennium comes, we shall all be well-fed, well-housed, well-clothed, and with only a few hours' work a day. We shall have science and art to occupy our leisure moments, and, if we please, we may cultivate our souls. But we opine that the cultivation of the soul seemed to Karl Marx a very subordinate matter, at most a branch of esthetics, and only to be undertaken when the masterful and all-important body had been well-housed and fed. This is a perfectly intelligible earthly or earthy paradise, and no doubt there are a great many people to whom it would appeal.

Let us set aside for the moment our conviction that the "remedies" proposed by Socialism would by no means bring these pleasant things to pass, but would, on the contrary, greatly aggravate our present evils. Let us go even further. Let us assume that not only these good things, but far more than the most imaginative Socialist has ever dared to promise, would come to pass; that mankind should be free, not only from hunger and want, from the pressure of care and necessity, but even from sickness and untimely death. Let us grant that such a state of things might come to pass, that every one should have plenty, with bodily health, and that this material well-being should be enjoyed by each of us for a hundred years before kindly death painlessly extinguished us. Would such an earthly paradise as this bring us a step nearer the kingdom of God? Would it realize that kingdom which John the Baptist announced and Jesus taught? Are Socialists of a certain type telling the truth when they say that their ideal is the ideal of Jesus, and that they are, therefore, justified in assuming the title of "Christian" Socialist?

A material paradise; a future condition of plenty upon earth. Is this the kingdom which Jesus came to preach? Is this the ideal for which he was crucified? Let us look to the records of the teaching. We had occasion, toward the end of May, to listen to two sermons by a "Chris-

tian" Socialist. In the first, he quoted St. Paul's splendid words to Timothy: "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day." From them he drew, by some strange process of reasoning, an argument for Karl Marx's earthly paradise. To this argument we shall return in a moment.

The other sermon was on a text from the Apocalypse, and the preacher sought to prove that the seer of Patmos had his eyes fixed, not on the growing splendor of the spiritual world, but on the "co-operative commonwealth;" on the comfortable earthly future of the Marxian economist. He chose those wonderful words of St. John: "I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. And I, John, saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. . . . And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away." This is a vision of the spiritual world, if ever there was one. Yet the preacher, greatly daring, twisted it into a forecast of the Socialist commonwealth, with its promise of earthly plenty to all. Surely such a sentence as this: "there shall be no more death" should have made him pause. For Socialism hardly promises to abolish death. Or he might have read such words as these: "and the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it." Does Socialism expect to supersede the sun and moon? But if one demand proof conclusive that John was looking, not to a condition of earthly comfort, but to the pure spiritual realms, we can find such proof here: "I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, . . . and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." Does Socialism promise that those who have been beheaded shall live and reign a thousand years?

We believe that John was speaking of the soul of his great fellow-worker, Paul, who was beheaded very shortly after he wrote to Timothy: "Now I am ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand." Did Paul expect to go to the Marxian paradise? When he spoke of "having a desire to depart and to be with Christ," was he filled with a prevision of the "co-operative commonwealth?" When he said, "to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain," was he thinking of nationalizing the means of production? Surely this is intellectual levity. If one thing is certain it is that Paul, after that marvellous awakening on the Damascus

road, when he talked with the Master whom he had persecuted, was filled with the belief in a spiritual rebirth, the birth of the spiritual man, the immortal. "So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory."

But we can learn from Paul himself whether the "new" millennium would have enlisted his sympathies, the millennium of abundant food and drink and clothing. We find in his letters such a sentence as this: "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." We find phrases with that peculiarly caustic humor which Paul sometimes shows, sentences such as these: "Meats for the belly, and the belly for meats: but God shall destroy both it and them." Or we find such words as these: "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting."

That is the note that rings through the New Testament, through all the teachings of the Apostles and the Master of the Apostles. The new birth from above, the birth into life eternal, life everlasting. Every writer in the New Testament strikes the same splendid chord. We have quoted Paul and John. Let us take the testimony of Peter and James and Jude. In the early days of the ministry of Jesus, Peter was, it is true, wedded to the hope of the earthly paradise. What comment did the Master make? A comment that should be forever decisive: "Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offense unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." After the Crucifixion, through long years of service, Peter's ideal became clear: "Ye have purified your souls, being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the work of God, which liveth forever. For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away." Peter, like John, has his vision of a world transformed, when "the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up." Does it not require more than common credulity to find in this a prophecy of "the economic revolution"? Jude echoes the same teaching: "These be they who separate themselves, sensual, having not the Spirit. But ye, beloved, building up yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost, keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life."

Here we may examine the statement that is often made, that the Apostles established a Socialistic or Communistic state at Jerusalem, after the Crucifixion. It is perfectly true, as the author of the Acts tells us, that "they had all things in common, neither was there any among them that lacked: for as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the Apostles' feet: and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need." This may seem Socialism, until we look a little closer. Then we shall see the fundamental difference. For Socialism purposes a co-operative body or society united together to produce commodities. It is before all a question of production. But we cannot find that the community described by Luke produced any commodities at all. On the contrary, it becomes perfectly evident from many passages in Paul's letters, that what was really established at Jerusalem was, not a co-operative society producing commodities, but the system of the payment of the clergy. Paul makes this perfectly clear when he writes to his friends at Corinth: "Have we not power to eat and drink? Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other Apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas (Peter)? If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things? Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things, live of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar? Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel. But I have used none of these things. . . . And it is further evident that the community at Jerusalem was not a productive body, from the fact that Paul was incessantly gathering money for them throughout Asia Minor and Greece, making collections for "the saints at Jerusalem."

It is even more evident that the community of the Apostles, during the ministry of Jesus, was in no sense a community for the production of commodities. Jesus called his disciples away from their avocations to preach his message. As he says again and again: "Verily I say unto you, there is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake, and the gospel's, but he shall receive an hundredfold now in this time, with persecutions; and in the world to come, eternal life." This is recorded by Matthew, Mark and Luke, in practically identical words. What is absolutely clear is that, from the standpoint of economics, Jesus established, not a co-operative society, but a body of preaching mendicants, just as Buddha did, five centuries earlier, and as many religious teachers had done before, in the East. It is perfectly obvious that from the moment they responded to the Master's summons, "Follow me!" the disciples ceased to be productive members of society in the economic sense. They were taken out of the realm of economics altogether. "Provide neither gold,

nor silver, nor brass in your purses, nor scrip for your journey; neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves: for the workman is worthy of his meat." This was a purely spiritual venture, and Jesus sent his disciples forth, relying on spiritual law. Their faith was completely vindicated: "He said unto them, when I sent you without purse, and scrip, and shoes, lacked ye anything? And they said, Nothing." So it is wholly misleading to cite this community as a model co-operative society, in the material sense. It is in essence a living protest against the whole theory of materialist economics. As we have already pointed out, the sentence "the laborer is worthy of his hire," refers to what we should call the payment of the clergy. It was used by Jesus to express the truth that the faithful disciple may rely on spiritual law to supply his material needs.

Is it necessary, after what we have said concerning the belief of the disciples and their constant ideal of the spiritual world and eternal life, to insist that the Master likewise had in view a purely spiritual realm when he spoke of the kingdom of God? Is it really necessary to deny that he had in view anything like the Marxian paradise of material well-being? Yet just that kind of misrepresentation is rife in the books and orations of the so-called "Christian" Socialism. Surely, if one thing is certain, it is that Jesus set no store by worldly success. "Lay not up treasure on earth; lay up treasure in heaven," is the thought that runs through all his teachings. Does he not perpetually tell us that his kingdom is "not of this world"? Does he not say, again and again: "He that loveth his life shall lose it; but he that hateth his life, shall keep it unto life eternal." Always the ideal of eternal life; surely that means something wholly different from the "co-operative commonwealth." If we assert that "the kingdom of God" means future earthly well-being, what sense are we to attach to the words: "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Can anything be clearer than the truth, that Jesus is speaking of the spiritual life, the life in the spiritual body, as St. Paul calls it, the rebirth into eternal life?

The truth is that the claim of the "Christian" Socialists, that they are upholding and furthering the ideal of Jesus, the ideal of his disciples, is absolutely false. If we stand at the foot of some pinnacle of the Alps and see two roads before us, one climbing by perilous paths to the white mystery of the summit, while the other leads away from the mountain over the plain to the lowlands, is it profitable to insist that the road over the plain is the same as the path to the summit; that, in fact, the plain is the summit; and that, in following the easy pathway of the lowlands we are true and hardy mountaineers and shall soon stand in the pure upper air and view the glories of the mountain-top? This is something

like what the Socialists are doing when they claim that their economic paradise of earthly well-being is that kingdom which Jesus came to preach, the ideal for which he was crucified. "My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence."

There remains one aspect of this question to which we shall now turn. Socialists are prone to affirm that their doctrine is a new gospel of love and brotherhood, and that as such it represents the evangel of Jesus and his disciples. This argument is, if possible, weaker than the other, concerning the kingdom of God. For it is indisputable that whatever they may say of *universal* brotherhood, the Socialists are perpetually preaching particular hatred. One never hears a Socialist oration in which there is not an attack on some class or classes, generally grouped under the detested title of "Capitalist." In the name of love and brotherliness, accusation, invective, sarcasm, hostility of every kind, are directed against "the rich;" and it is quite certain the "love" with which they are treated is indistinguishable from hate. But did not Jesus preach against precisely this limitation of love when he said: "Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you, that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven; for if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same?" This should be a sufficient answer to the Socialist teaching of "class consciousness," which is really indistinguishable from class hatred.

Much has been made of the saying of Jesus: "Sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, take up the cross, and follow me." But surely, from the point of view of Socialism, it is merely foolish to speak of treasure in heaven, when what is really desired is treasure upon earth. And what more vain, for those whose ideal is earthly well-being, than the injunction to "take up the cross"? But the decisive point lies in the young man's question. He did not ask: "What shall I do to found the co-operative commonwealth?" He did not ask: "What shall I do to improve the condition of the working classes?" What he did ask was, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" And from the standpoint of the Marxian paradise, no question could well be more inane.

We cannot too clearly understand that Jesus did not come primarily to teach universal brotherhood, to bid us love our neighbor as ourselves.

He came to teach us that we should first love God. This is the first and greatest commandment. We must put the first things first. Jesus taught that we must first settle our relations with God, and only then can we settle our relations with our neighbor. We must seek, find and obey the divine light in our hearts before we can in any sense love our neighbor or render him any service that is worth rendering. Through this primary obedience to God and to divine law, we shall come into an understanding of life which is purely spiritual and worlds apart from the view of materialistic Socialism. We shall see that God works through poverty as well as riches; through sickness as well as health; through privation, loneliness, sorrow, not less than through peace and quietness and rest. All these are God's ministers, and to each of us he fits the lesson which is needed, setting each in that place in life which shall give the needed teaching. When we have found and obeyed the divine law we shall understand this, and it will be impossible for us to bring a railing accusation against any class or condition of life.

And we may well remember that though Jesus considered every condition and rank in life, from Cæsar to the mendicant by the wayside, in no case do we find him denouncing any condition or station. In every case, what he denounces, is a false attitude toward life, whatever be the condition. Having, as we believe, all the spiritual power of the Master, he did not use that power to change the condition of the state, even when he worked among a subject nation, under the yoke of foreign conquest. It was ever to the heart he addressed himself, knowing well that if the heart be pure the life also will be pure; knowing, likewise, that nothing so darkens the vision of life as a grossly material purpose, united with bitter animosity toward any class or division of our brothers. Jesus had, as we believe, such power as would have enabled Him to change the whole social state of Palestine, to turn the Roman Empire upside down. Why did He not exert that power? Because not by material means can the purposes of the soul be compassed, but by the powers of the Spirit, and first of all by obedience to the will of God. We must put the first things first; and this is the first thing: full, hearty and implicit obedience to the divine will, the divine light in the heart. By obedience we learn the laws of life. By obedience we come to understand the real needs of our brother. By obedience alone do we gain the power really to supply the least of these needs.

For these reasons we are convinced that the ideal of Jesus is the very antithesis of the ideal of the Socialists. The one path leads uphill to the sunlit summits; the other down through the valley to the lowlands. It is vain and foolish to tell us that the plain is the mountain. And it is even more vain to tell us that Socialism, with its paradise of sensual

contentment, in anything resembles that kingdom of God, spiritual and immortal, which Jesus came to teach. The two are as far apart as death and life. He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption. He that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting.

It can hardly be doubted that new forms of worship, new epitomes of belief, new theories of theology, will spring up to comfort and strengthen the human heart as we advance farther and farther into the truth. Different summaries will appeal simultaneously to equally Christian men and women. But so long as they conceive the Diety as fulfilling their highest ideal, and cleave to that ideal with their whole mind and heart and strength, they will fulfill the command of Christ. Which religious system is best? We must decide by results. There is no rule of thumb. By their fruits we shall know them. In which mountain shall we worship? Christ refused to consider such a question. It is this eternal element in Christ's teaching which explains the limitlessness of its moral demand. Had He not pushed as He did push in the Sermon on the Mount, every virtue to the vanishing point; had He not demanded of His followers limitless forgiveness, untiring generosity, mercy without measure, truth without afterthought, faith to remove mountains, endurance till the end, He could not have called into play the whole moral and spiritual ambition, not only of the men to whom He spoke, but of all men forever. No system which absolves men from the duty of thinking can ever be profitable to them, can ever make them into full men. It may save them from much pain—so may paralysis. No doubt it satisfies a craving which exists in the human mind, but it is a craving for stupor—like that which lends attraction to narcotics—not the craving Christ sought to stimulate for more abundant life. It is self-control, not obedience, which is the moral goal of man. No teacher who tried to cross the purpose of evolution could ever be rightly regarded as divine. In Christ's renunciation of authority lies His divine authority. His spirit is the spirit which leads us to the light by the hard path of liberty, and to that spirit He sacrificed the exercise of a lordship such as He warned His Disciples to avoid. The spirit of truth coming forth from God was, He said, alone sufficient to guide the world, and as He meditated upon that "power from on high" He was able to say: "It is expedient for you that I go away."—*London Spectator*.

FUNDAMENTAL ASPECTS OF RELIGION.*

WHAT is, perhaps, the most fundamental and obvious of all the many aspects of Religion and the religious life, is one that it had not occurred to me to speak of to-day, but which was brought vividly to my mind as I entered this hall. At the door our good hosts of the Dayton Branch have placed this notice: "A Lecture on Fundamental Aspects of Religion. *Free.*" In that one word they have spoken deeply and profoundly of the fundamentals of Religion. They are *free* to each and every one of us. No limitation of environment, no circumstance, no bars nor hedge nor walls shut out Religion. We may be deprived of all things else. Place and fame may be lost or never have been ours. Fortune may have passed us by. Ease and comfort may be denied us. We may have no time for the acquirement of science, no leisure for the pursuit of art, no means nor opportunity for surrounding our lives with outer beauty. Over outer things circumstances have mastery, but over our inner lives they have no dominion. Whatever of strength and nobility and beauty, whatever of peace and power and joy, exist in Religion, are ours for the taking, are inalienably the heritage of man, as man. It behooves us therefore to examine our heritage and to learn for ourselves what this one thing is which no man can take from us, which, throughout the ages, has been prized by some as infinitely more precious than all else in life, and by others left neglected as a thing too cheap and common to have value in their sight.

There are two ways in which we may approach our subject, two view-points which we may adopt toward Religion. The first give us the historical view. In it we look back upon a religion as upon a great historic system, owing its origin to the teaching of some historic character, and to some strange inspiration and "other-worldliness," which we do not share. Like our civilization or our laws, this aspect of Religion comes to us out of the past. It seems something imposed upon us from without, external and foreign to ourselves, but to which we are expected to conform. It shows itself as the bidding of authority, and brings with it the entanglements, confusion and doubt which are ever inseparable from questions of history and authority, necessitating the weighing of evidence, the sifting of the probable from the merely possible, the logical and permanent from the accidental and temporary.

*A lecture given at Dayton, Ohio, at the time of the Annual Convention of the Theosophical Society, April 26, 1908.

The second way of viewing Religion is the very antithesis of the first. It is the psychological or biological view as opposed to the historical. In it Religion appears no longer as something external to ourselves, but as the most intimate and inherent of all human emotions, moving the heart and nature of every man, expressive of himself and of life. As the other view led us to the religions of authority, so this view leads us to the Religion of the Spirit. Where before we were ensnared in historic confusion and doubtful metaphysic, here we are grounded directly upon experience, and the truth or falsity of our view must be tested by experience. This is the test of science. We do not argue of a statement in chemistry whether it is probable or logical that two colorless liquids should combine to yield a powder of a brilliant blue. We do not need to inquire over closely into the personality of the one who makes this statement. We realize rather that its verification lies in the experiment, that if we would know for ourselves we must try and see, following the directions and observing the results. The same tests must be applied to the Religion of the Spirit, to the science of the life and growth and consciousness of the Soul of Man. We must live the life to know the doctrine; live the life completely if we are to know the doctrine completely; but already living it in part, we can now know in part. It is this point of view which I desire to adopt to-day, and, in asking you to consider with me certain fundamental aspects of religion, I shall ask you to accept nothing of what I say which can not be verified within your own experience.

If we reflect upon our own lives we find that we are living in two worlds at once. First there is the external world—the world of facts and forces, of trees and flowers and growing things, of animal and insect life, of storm and sudden cataclysm, as well as of houses and railway trains and electric light; in short, all that vast outer world of mechanism in which we are enmeshed, upon which we act and which reacts upon us. It is with this world that physical science deals, and our very existence depends upon at least a partial mastery of its laws and powers. But as we look deeper we find something more than this. We find we are also living in an inner world of feelings, ideals and aspirations which seem curiously personal and at once to separate us from the rest of life and to unite us thereto. And very quickly we realize that it is this inner world that gives values to the outer; that in the outer life what we regard as precious or as worthless depends upon the inner attitude we have adopted. It is with this inner attitude toward life, with this inner world of values, and with its curious opposing tendencies of separateness and unity, that Religion is primarily concerned.

It is in our power to strengthen either of these two tendencies, towards unity or towards separateness, the one at the expense of the other, according to the feelings, ambitions and ideals we entertain. This

enables us to classify our feelings under two great heads; first, those which augment the sense of separateness, and, second, those which give us a clearer consciousness of unity. Under the first head, as tending towards separateness we must place hatred, greed, fear, envy, ugliness, evil-speaking and listening, vanity and self-seeking of all kinds. And as tending toward unity we shall find: sympathy, love, generosity, courage, beauty, charity, self-sacrifice and appreciation of others. This is a classification susceptible of immediate experimental verification. Consider the pair of opposites, greed and generosity. Can there be any doubt as to which of these two tends toward unity and which toward separation? So with hatred and love; the one puts us over against our enemy in an intensity of opposition which makes us feel there can be no common thing between us. The other opens our hearts until our life is so blended with our love that we become consciously one with it. Or, again, with evil speaking and charity, fear and courage, ugliness and beauty, whether in ourselves or others, the first of each pair is repellent, shutting us within our narrow self, while the second is expansive, drawing us out toward unity. This is a moral classification and in it we have the beginnings of that sense of oneness with the whole of life which is basic in Religion. It may be unconscious or unformulated, but it must be there. We must be capable of being exalted by that which is other than our personality.

We have all experienced this exaltation. It may have come to us through the beauty of nature, or through the heroism of which human history is full, or through some homely act of simple service. But I am sure that it has come to each and every one of us and through it our nature responds to the greater life about it, is carried out of its fragmentary self into the larger Self of the whole, and is exalted by the mere presence in the universe of such beauty or power or worth. To experience this, is to experience the fact that the true Self of Man is not confined to his personality but is one with all that is. To be unable to experience it in any form is to be a dullard, unmoved by anything but his own body, isolated from all that is rich and universal—such a one as, I believe, neither you nor I have ever met. Man is not set over against the universe but is included in it and lives with the larger life of which he is a part.

The last fifty years of scientific research have brought profoundly impressive insights into the marvelous complexity and co-ordination of the universe, but in nothing has our gain been greater than in the realization of the universality and completeness of law. We are beginning to realize that the Universe is indeed one, with all its parts linked and knit together by laws to which there can be no exceptions, no violations. We can disobey a command but we cannot break a law. Con-

sider, for example, the law of gravitation. We throw a stone into the air. Its impetus is against the force of gravity and the stone rises. Is the law broken? Ultimately the stone descends. Was the law then suspended? We know better than this. We know that the whole flight of the stone was in obedience to law at each and every moment of its course, as well when it was rising in apparent violation of law as when falling in apparent fulfillment thereof. We know this of the stone and the law of gravitation, but it is equally true of all other things and all other laws. Law as law is at once inviolable and sacred—inviolable because it cannot be broken, sacred because it co-ordinates and unifies the whole.

But not only does law co-ordinate the universe, it causes its infinite richness. Differences in substance and character are but differences in the laws obeyed. The wood of the table differs from the brass of the lamp in that the one will unite with oxygen and burn in the air while the other will not; one will float in water, the other will not, and these are but distinctions in laws. What a thing is, is determined by the laws it obeys, and the evolution of a life is but the gradual change in its response to law.

If this is true of substance it is equally true of man. What a man is, is determined by the laws he obeys, and the laws he obeys are determined by the ideals he loves, for love is the prototype of law. Just as in the outer world it is law which both co-ordinates and causes the infinite richness of form and nature, so in the inner world it is love which fulfills the same two-fold function. But there is this further difference between man and substance. We can ourselves choose that toward which we shall aspire and the laws which we obey, and thus determine what we are to be.

This is the meaning of free will. We are the creators of our own inner lives. Daily, hourly, momentarily we are creating ourselves, determining, in our aspirations, the laws which are hereafter to rule us, which are to become for us our environment and our character. Not only *may* we choose, we are compelled to choose. "Everything has two handles by which it may be carried. Thy brother hath done thee an injury. An injury hath been done thee? Pick it not up by that, for by that handle thou canst not bear it. But by this: He is thy brother." Always there is a choice, always we must choose, either toward unity, or towards separateness. And what we choose that we become. Religion is evolution become conscious.

If we choose separateness, to act against the great current and movement of life, then are we self-doomed to futility in act and the mortality of that which we become. Like the stone flung from earth, which must return again, so man flung by his own act from the great

heart of life must return thereto. The personality he has built up of separateness and selfishness is self-doomed to be undone—that he may build again of unity and love.

Mortality is not a curse but a blessing. It is the mortality of evil, in order that in each of us the good may endure. Which one of us dare pray to live, to live as he is now? Which one of us would so face the eternal? As we choose so we become. We may choose wisely. Then what we build is permanent, and endures, one with all that is. Or we may choose badly—for separateness and the smaller self. Then what we build into ourselves is impermanent and must be again undone. In pain and sorrow and death we return again to the unity from which we came.

Are we then left unguided to choose blindly or by the moments whim? I am sure that we are not. Always there is an inner guidance if we will but listen to it. Call it by what name you please, the Will of the Father, the Voice of God, the guidance of the man's own soul, always there is the tug at his heart of the great life current, the great breath or evolutionary stream of the whole universe, passing through that one point where he now stands. We are not without the universe but in it and so, wherever we may be, there is always this great current pulling at our hearts.

No man has ever earnestly sought this inner guidance and failed to find it; though there are many who have not recognized it, and many more who have rejected it when found. At first it is hard to understand why, finding, we should not realize what we have found, but as we look into our own minds we see the reasons. We note how muffled and distant seems the voice of a conscience, long disused and neglected, long overlaid by the desires of the personality, and how frequently its promptings appear irrelevant to the immediate question we think so vitally important. We have cried out for guidance in what we deem a crisis of our lives. We have seemed to ourselves to have reached the forking of the road and must turn to right or left. We seek a sign and upon the momentous issue there is silence. We seek further and there rises into the mind some simple, homely counsel, some reminder of a forgotten duty whose startling irrelevancy to our question seems a mockery of our prayer. We turn away in bitter impatience. This is what we do and have done. But we are not wise in doing it. Are our questions as simple as we think? Was the issue really what we deemed it? Or could we tell what that unfulfilled task might have brought us of new illumination? Like a log jam in a river, our lives are blocked by duties unperformed; or tangled like a skin of thread we had not patience to unravel—and conscience guides us to the crucial point where working we may free the knot. Perhaps you question this? The test is in experience. To every man who will listen some command is

given. Try it and see. Ask of yourselves: what is the Will of the Father for me, here and now, and listen to the answer. When you have heard, test it by obedience, for this is the ultimate and the only test.

Too seldom is this test applied. We ask, and are answered, and—do nothing. Obedience would be so uncomfortable. The answer, we think, was not what we want. We persuade ourselves we are suffering from a foolish morbid conscience and we turn back to our old-time routine. Obedience would mean renunciation and we are not ready to renounce.

If we looked upon this entirely impersonally, without experience of human life, I think we could not but expect that, of all possible desires or commands, this inner voice, this expression of the inmost nature of man's heart, would receive most instant and joyous obedience. We should expect to find the instant assent: "Yes, this is what I want." And we should expect to rise up joyously in immediate direct pursuit thereof, not thinking of what we were leaving, not even knowing that we were renouncing what we had realized we no longer desired. In some temperaments we can find this instant recognition and enthusiasm. But they are exceptional rather than the rule. Few of us have this ability to keep our faces turned forward to what we would win. We insist upon looking back at what we are leaving, and our past enslaves us. Laziness and inertia, our passions and emotions, our love of pleasure, our ambitions and our fears, all chain us to the past. Habit binds us. We act from outgrown desires not yet outlived. We find we are not free to follow, but are tied in a thousand ways. One by one we must undo the knots that bind us and which we ourselves have tied. Little by little we must put aside and away all that separates us from the heart of life and from the ideal within the heart. We must practise Renunciation.

What is it that now hampers your will? What is it that hedges you around until you fear to move? What is it that makes you afraid? These are the things you renounce. Through renunciation you become able to obey, and through obedience you are brought back to the inner unity and become free, free to be yourself.

It needs faith to renounce, faith in the completeness of law. "We who have enthroned law in the physical world put ourselves strangely outside its realm. We cannot realize that our lives have their appointed course, that we have no need for this anxious fevered self-seeking, that the path of our fate is marked for us by our daily duties, and that we can trust our fate. We need faith in the completeness of law. We need still more to feel and have faith in the love behind law, and we need the courage to trust ourselves to this completely—desiring only what is ours." If we have this faith we have the answer to our mental

doubts and questionings. It gives us, as it were, the logic of obedience and renunciation. But the motive of obedience is not its logic, and the power which moves and supports us is felt as love rather than as law. A renunciation that is conscious and reasoned is but half fulfilled. Our gift should be a gift of love, our thought fixed not on what we are giving but to whom or what we give it. We have need to look continually to the good with which we would become one, and to have our hearts so held by that, that they cannot turn in regret to what is left behind. Otherwise we waiver in sterile indecision, the well-springs of our inspiration dry, and we ourselves, as in the symbol of Lot's wife, become but pillars of salt.

So far we have seen that Religion, whatever it may mean of worth or of power, is open and free to each and every one of us. We have seen also that it is concerned primarily with the inner world of values, of ideals and motives and causes, in which man dwells even more truly and more consciously than in the outer world of mechanism and effects. And we noted that the religious tendency is always toward unity, always toward opening man's heart to the consciousness and life of the greater whole of which he is a part. We have learned that everywhere is the action of law, diversifying, co-ordinating, unifying, and that man is free to choose the laws he will obey. We want to be quite clear upon that last point for it is very frequently disputed. We know of our own experience that at each instant we have a certain power of choice. We can put our wills toward one thing or another and according to our wills we can modify our acts. We do not need to say we can overcome at once the habits and tendencies of the past. The past may well be too strong for that. But what we must remember is that it is past, and that however great be the initial impulse, it can be outworn and overcome by even the smallest of forces constantly applied. It is by virtue of this fact that man is master of his own destiny, and able, if he be willing, to follow the inner guidance of the Soul. This inner guidance is of two-fold character, first the general guidance of our ideals and aspirations, which constitute, as it were, the image of our next stage in evolution, and second the particular and immediate guidance of our conscience, voicing each moment's duty.

Having come thus far it is natural to ask ourselves to what this guidance leads, though the longer we travel on this path the less we question its end, for we begin to realize it has no end and that eternal progress is itself our goal. By this I do not mean that we seek change for change's sake, but only that we begin to realize that the heart and essence of life is not a dead, still thing but a living breath, and that life for us is union with this breath and so is always motion. Always there is growth, always there is service, always there is the onward call of the Master's voice, and as we come to experience growth and service and

obedience we find our goal in them, and do not question overmuch what lies beyond. And yet there is a beyond to which we are led. It is the Kingdom of the Heavens whose gates lie open to us here and now, and at whose portals we enter upon eternal life.

So far reaches the test of our own experience. Now at the threshold of a new life, new experience must test and prove our vision. Some small measure of this may be already ours, but the greater part is still beyond us and for its description we must turn back to the records left by those who have preceded us. Here it is that the historic view of Religion receives its transformation in our sight, and what before was foreign to our hearts and minds now ministers to an inner need and comes as a message from a comrade on our path. One and all these records tell us the same story—the story of the birth and growth and life of the Soul of Man. And its beginning we ourselves know, of ourselves. Its end no man knows. But where we are, there is guidance, both of the inner voice and of the outer record, and the two are one. For this is the small old path that leads to the Eternal, the same from age to age, in all times and among all peoples.

As by obedience we become one with the inner heart and current of life, our personal daily lives take on new meaning and new dignity. We could see in advance that this must be so, for our personal wills have become one with the divine will and our life expressive of divine law. Each new duty is a new gift. In each, life gives us some new insight or new power. We learn to see into the hearts of others and we become filled with a great reverence for life, with an abiding sense of its beauty and its sacredness.

As we become free we become joyous, and with joy comes power. Sacrifice and joy are the two great creative principles, and of each of these we learn and each we make our own, learning as we do so that they are not two but one—two views of the one power, each meaningless without the other.

We do not need to say we "believe in God." We are daily and hourly supported by this great life current, surrounded by the majesty and power and beauty of existence which we would feel to be the very spirit of God did we not sense a deeper wonder still beyond our ken. So also with the Communion of Saints, or the knowledge of the Masters. We enter into the companionship of those who have gone before us. At first it may be intangible, very subtle and illusive, but little by little it grows clearer and more definite. We realize that we are in truth "living in a cloud of witnesses," and that our eyes are opening on the inner and immortal world.

This then is at once the path and goal of the religious life. It is also the great adventure whose call is never silent in our hearts. Have we the courage, the quick high spirit, the resolution, the endurance and

the faith to undertake it? It cannot appeal to the dullard, nor can it be followed by the coward. It leads us far away from the old motives of our lives, though on the surface perhaps little difference may be seen. We cease to live for pleasure, for ease, for comfort or security. We cease to struggle for ourselves. We accept whatever duty may be ours, knowing that all that comes to us is for our good. We cease to fear, and learn that the soul of man can pass through pain and sorrow and bodily death, gaining from them all. We face the universe unafraid and follow with high heart the small still voice that leads us on. We learn the power of appreciation, to enter into the lives of others and know their beauty and their meaning. We learn that we are one with all that is. We learn the sacredness and universality of law, the power of renunciation, and the freedom from our past and from ourselves who alone can bind us. By obedience we enter into life, into its heart and essence, the inner world of immortality. We come to know for ourselves the truth of Christ's promise:

"If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him."

No higher promise than this was ever made to man, no greater heritage could be ours. Have we the courage and the faith to claim it; the courage and the faith for this the greatest of all adventures? Have we the courage? Have we the faith?

HENRY BEDINGER MITCHELL.

All have to go through the Vow of Poverty, in all parts of the nature, and when we have passed it, we have passed one of the greatest initiations. It is the fear of Poverty we have to conquer, the dependence upon wealth of all kinds. So, since the call has come, let us accomplish that task which is harder than passing through the eye of a needle—let us not refuse to answer the call of the Master.

BOOK OF ITEMS.

WHAT THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY IS NOT.*

WE have been considering, during this period of reunion, that it is just a third of a century since the Theosophical Society was founded in New York, by H. P. Blavatsky and her colleagues, in November, 1875. Looking back over these eventful years, we are again and again reminded that one of the chief obstacles to our progress has been the ceaseless misrepresentation, based on misunderstanding, to which we have been subjected by all sorts and conditions of men. In view of this constant misunderstanding, for which we ourselves are mainly to blame, it may not be unprofitable for us to take stock, to try to come to a clear statement of what the Theosophical Society is not.

It was my good fortune to join the Theosophical Society when it was not yet ten years old, and to know personally and intimately nearly every one of its foremost members, whether in this country, where it was founded, in Europe, where it had its first Branch Society, or in India, where so much of its eventful life was lived. It is, perhaps, natural that one who has thus reached the reminiscent stage should prefer to treat this question historically; and this is what I shall try to do.

We may learn what the Theosophical Society is not, by recalling what it originally was: a band of students, met together to search for truth. This high and noble quest had one condition: that it should be carried out in the spirit of perfect tolerance; that each truth-seeker should have the fullest liberty to look for truth wherever he might hope to find it, and the utmost freedom in expressing his conclusions, whatever they might be, provided only that he should be ready to allow to all his fellow-searchers an equal liberty, both of quest and of expression. This was the general spirit in which the Theosophical Society was founded; and very many subjects were taken up for examination, in those early days: theories as to the magic of the ancient Egyptians; the phenomena of spiritualism and mesmerism; traditions of Oriental lore; records of medieval miracles. All was studied, in the reverent love of truth and the spirit of toleration.

The reason for this tolerance was the deep-rooted belief of the Founders of the Society that no one of us is in possession of all truth, or

* An address delivered before the Theosophical Society in Convention, at Dayton, Ohio, on April 26, 1908.

even of the greater part of truth; but that to each one who sincerely seeks, some fragment of truth will be revealed. And only by the gathering together of these fragments, as a Chinese puzzle is put together, can a larger, deeper view of truth be gained. Each one, therefore, must reverence his own truth; and each one must remember that very much of truth, still unrevealed to him, is stored in his neighbors' hearts, waiting for him to seek it. So he must add to his own truth the truth seen by his neighbors also; and only so can he hope to reach a wide and sane understanding of the riddle of the world.

This is a principle of very wide application. Let me try to illustrate it in certain familiar fields. To give such an illustration, and to make it practical, I should like to gather here representative members of the various sects and churches of Christendom; and we should not flinch at the word sect, for we must remember that one of the earliest names for Christianity itself was "the sect of the Nazarenes," or, to use the Greek word, "the heresy of the Nazarenes." Well, I should like to assemble here representatives of every Church and sect. I should like to begin with some member of the Eastern Church, perhaps from the Patriarchate of Antioch, where "the disciples were first called Christians," or Alexandria, which claims descent from Saint Mark. And I should ask this representative to tell us, from the depth of his heart, what he believes to be the deepest truth as to the teaching of the Christ. To this I should like to add the deepest truth as it appears to a member of the Roman Church, so profoundly identified with the history of the Western world, from the days of the Cæsars, and all through the Middle Ages. Perhaps such a one would lay the greatest stress on authority and unity, as the member of the Oriental Church may have laid stress on primitive tradition, on the earliest order of Church government. Or perhaps our member of the Roman Church might hold that saintship, as of Saint Catherine, abnegation, as of Saint Francis, sacrifice, as in the lives of glorious unnamed millions, was the chiefest thing, giving virtue to both unity and authority. Then I should seek some believer in the Reformation, some one whose heart flamed with the zeal of Luther, of Melancthon, who sought above all to make religion personal, a matter of commune between the individual soul and God, a communion outweighing both unity and authority. And to these I would add a member of the Anglican communion, with its balanced and eclectic spirit, taking so much from the older Church of the West, and much also from the Reformers; and tempering what was thus taken by an ancient and venerable tradition, going back to apostolic times. Then I should wish to add the saintly fervor of the Friends, followers of Fox and his spirit of quietude; the passionate zeal for righteousness of a Wesley; the searching after apostolic government, of the Congregational and Presbyterian bodies; and many, perhaps, of the minor sects, even

the most heretical, since each has worshipped some divine spark, brightly gleaming for him alone.

And having gathered these together, I should ask each one to say, from the depth of a sincere heart, and as speaking in their great Founder's presence, what they held to be the deepest truth concerning Christ and Christ's religion; and while each spoke, I should ask the others to listen reverently, simply, not seeking to contravert, seeking only to understand. Then, when all had spoken and received this generous hearing, I think we should find that the various truths put forward would blend in one truth, and that we should have a presentment of the Christ's teaching that would win the approval of the Christ himself. More than that, from the generous and gentle hearing that all had given to each, we should have realized something of that oneness of heart which inspired the disciples, when they listened among the hills of Galilee, drawn together by their love for the Master himself.

That would be the Theosophical method, applied to the great problem of Christianity. Nor would I stop there. Just the same thing could be done for Buddhism. I would assemble the priest of Ceylon, the Tibetan lama, the Burmese temple-votary, the learned Sanskrit-speaking Japanese, the inland Chinaman, the Javanese or Sumatran from their ruined island shrines; and from each I should seek his deepest understanding of the Buddha's secret; his vision of what was taught in the bamboo garden, or beneath the red-fingered Asoka tree, by Siddhartha the Compassionate, after that memorable going-forth from the palace of Kapilavastu, twenty-five hundred years ago. To the reverently held tradition of the Pali devotee we should then add some of the Northern Buddhist's lofty, penetrating thought, the magical sense of the lama, the sunny heart of the Burman, the fire of Japan, the compassionate love of mankind that belongs not to one sect of the Buddha's followers, but to all. There again, we should have a Buddhism that even the Prince Siddhartha himself would accept, something like the teaching that fired the hearts of Ananda and the first disciples.

And having gone thus far, what would be more natural than to follow the same method for the older Indian faiths, hearing the worshipper of Krishna, as well as the follower of Krishna's wisdom; the Vedic Brahman, as the heretical Jaina; the devotee of Shiva, lord of ascetics, not less than the mystical Vedantin, the intellectual Sankhya. Then we should have, from lips deeply reverent and hearts full of faith, something of the ancient Indian wisdom in its pristine purity and richness. And from India we might pass to China, from China to Persia, from Persia to Chaldea, from Chaldea to Egypt. Nor should we forget the older faiths of fading peoples, like the natives of Central America or the New Zealand Aborigine with his brothers scattered through the vast blue wilderness of the Southern Seas.

Having thus sought, and in some sense found, the pure recondite spirit of all faiths, might we not then, greatly daring, bring them all into each others' presence; and from their assembling, from the open-hearted and reverent hearing of every faith, learn something of the One Religion that has inspired all religions, but has never been completely realized in any religion? In the company of immortals thus assembled, I doubt not we should find a singular oneness of heart, a smiling triumphant understanding, each recognizing each as a brother, a friend from of old, before all time.

Such would be the Theosophical method, as applied to the world's religions. The work of reconciliation thus begun, should be carried far. For there are not only the religions of the past; there are the real and living religions of to-day; the faithful service of Nature's law, the search for impersonal truth in the rocks and mountains, in the ocean depths, in the spaces of the stars; the seeking after Nature's powers, to learn their mystery, to bring them into service, to subject them to the divine, all-conquering will of man. Here, the Theosophical method is most happily at work already. We are in presence of just such an assembling of scientific truth as I have imagined for religious truth; we see the seekers in each nook and corner of nature bringing their treasures to the common fund; we behold the student of each lesser law trying to bring it into understood relation with the vaster Law, seeking to come to some wide and general comprehension of the oneness of all things.

Is there then no need for the Theosophical method here? On the contrary there is much need. For we have yet to bridge the gulf between the first great body of truth and the second; between the tremendous ascertained facts and laws that underlie all religion, and the more outward facts and laws that make up our science to-day. Here again, the fundamental Theosophical procedure, "gently to hear, kindly to speak," has its miracles still to work, and when they are worked, there will be that wherewith to give food to the lives of multitudes.

Will our task be ended, when we have brought into brotherly unity and common understanding the great verified truths of the past and the great ascertained truths of the present? Far from it. There will still remain the tremendous verities not yet known or guessed at, the vast and splendid truths still unrevealed. We look, therefore, toward the truth of the future, as well as of the present and the past. Are there not already whisperings in the inner consciousness of man, of powers wonderful and immortal, of growth that will make man a divinity, of realms, far wider and deeper than the waste abysses of the stars, which we are invited to enter? Shall we not keep our hearts open for these new truths, always uncertain of welcome, always regarded with suspicious shyness, very often rejected, spurned, misinterpreted, belied? Have we not the warning of Galileo, who brought to the world wonderful new truths and

new vistas of life, and who was forced on his knees to recant, to give the lie to what he knew to be true? Have we not the later spectacle of Darwin, attacked, abused, denounced, condemned, because, with wonderful gentleness and reverence he sought to give new insight into the ways of the working God? Have we not the supreme instance of the prophet of Galilee, who was crucified by a howling mob, because he brought new and unwelcome truth to those who believed they already had all truth?

But you may think that, in our own day and generation, there will be a wider welcome for new truths. Happily, this is so to a large degree, but I am reminded that it has not always been so; it has not been so even during the few years since the Theosophical Society was founded. Here, on the right of the platform, is the picture of H. P. Blavatsky, whom I knew well during several years. She also was a bringer of new truths: truths indeed which were full of power and healing, which added a wonderful value to all life. But was she welcomed for her treasure of new truth? By a few, yes. By the great multitude, not at all. And there were not wanting those who, unable to receive the new truth she brought, turned against her violently, with accusations of fraud, of dishonesty, of trickery, and thus blinded the hearts of the multitude to the truth she brought, the message she announced. For years she was pursued by accusations and attacks, and at last she died, as veritably a martyr to truth as any of the pioneers of by-gone days. And here also is the picture of another valued friend, W. Q. Judge, who likewise lived for a truth that was beyond his time, beyond the understanding of some of those who worked with him. He also was made the target of accusation and denunciation, and died as truly a martyr as any primitive saint. So we shall do well to remember that, while our own days are more liberal and open-minded, there is yet deep in the human heart this ingrained suspicion of new truth, this tendency to resist development; and here, perhaps, more than anywhere else, is a wide field for the Theosophical method, of gentle hearing, kindly speaking; the method which the Theosophical Society lives to further and put in practice.

This, then, is the work and office of the Theosophical Society, as I understand it; this is the work which, on its foundation, it set itself to do. But I may be asked, if this be the Theosophical Society, what is Theosophy, what is the Theosophical Teaching, of which so much has been said? To me, it seems to be this: We have imagined a coming together of the followers of the Christ, from every church and sect, Eastern and Western, traditional and evangelical alike; all coming together in the spirit of truth, each seeking to declare the deepest truth that was in him concerning the Master's teaching; each ready and willing to give ear to the other's truth. And we have imagined that thus we might come at the true teaching of the Master, the veritable spiritual life which

he both lived and revealed. And so with the other world-faiths, those of the older and the younger nations alike, from New Zealand to Guatemala. If we should thus gather together the just men made perfect, of every clime, each with his heart full of the deepest truth of his faith and race, and if these, coming into living communion, should thus gather the world's truth in a united whole, that, in my view would be Theosophy. That, indeed, is Theosophy; for I believe that this assembling is not an imagination but a reality; the oldest reality in human life. And it was as a beacon and inspiration to the Theosophical Society, in its great work of reconciliation, that something of Theosophy was given to us; a part only, yet enough to lead us to realize the greatness and splendor of the whole.

There are other fields wherein the Theosophical method has much work to do. Take the question of race-difference, and especially of those deeper differences, as between the white races and the yellow, or the white races and the black, which already loom so large in our world-politics. It recently befell me to read the old records, from the late fifteenth century downward, of the first contact of our white races with the colored races of Asia and the races of the New World. And as I read, I felt profoundly ashamed for the men of my own color; whether in the East, or in the West, the tale was marred by spoliation, craft, robbery, violence, dishonor. It is a dark and evil record; and one cannot read it without shame. Here, once more, it is true that our own days have seen much betterment; yet very much remains to be done. It cannot be doubted that within a few years we shall see the yellow races of Asia, to the number of five hundred millions, as fully armed and equipped with our best inventions as are the Japanese, the pioneers of the yellow races, to-day. What shall we do in the face of that world-problem? What shall we do, a little later, when a like world-problem arises in Africa, with its uncounted millions of the black race? I answer, if we are to meet these problems with safety, we must put in force the Theosophical method. Instead of dwelling on the differences between us and these men of other hue until we come to hate them, we must approach them in a kindly spirit of understanding; recognizing frankly their good and lovable qualities, their strength in certain things wherein we are weak; our ability to help them in those things wherein we are strong. Thus coming into friendly and cordial relations with them, we shall presently come to see that there is no necessary strife between us; that our likenesses are far more vital than our differences; and that, as for our differences, the wise thing is to accept them frankly on both sides, agreeing to differ, in the genuine Theosophical spirit. Thus, and only thus, can we safely surmount the difficulties, piling up mountain high, between the races of different color, difficulties which it is for our century to solve, on pain of throwing the human race into internecine strife

and confusion for generations. Here, the Theosophical method is infinitely more potent than fleets of battleships, and infinitely more benign.

For as Theosophists we by no means desire that all men should ignore their differences in a dead level of uniformity. This is not our ideal, whether for humanity as a whole, or for our Society in particular. We in no way seek uniformity of opinion, unanimity of belief. On the contrary, I for my part would welcome a far greater diversity of opinion, of belief, of faiths, of races, than exists in our Society to-day. We ought to have many races and creeds represented. Indeed, we should have men and women of every race on the globe within our ranks, and we would welcome them there. Nor should we seek to minimize their difference; on the contrary, we should ask each to express his own ideal, the ideal of his own race and faith, in its highest and noblest form; and then ask that all should admit and accept these differences, in the spirit of perfect tolerance and freedom, the spirit of that deeper unity which underlies all difference.

Thus we should have assembled the grand orchestra of man. And just as, in the orchestra of the musician, we do not ask the violins to become uniform with the trumpets, nor the harps to repeat the note of the horns, but rather demand that each shall be perfect in its own kind, the harp as a harp, the violin as a violin; so in that greater orchestra of man, we should ask that each should be his or her best self, his or her own highest attainment, and so should we see perfected the true universal brotherhood of mankind.

This is the Theosophical method, as applied to the great and fundamental questions of race, creed, color, sex; and the Theosophical Society exists to put this method in practise, and to do so ever more abundantly. We have no creeds to offer, we have no dogmas to enforce, we seek no uniformity of opinion, no oneness of practice or belief. In the spirit of toleration, of spiritual freedom, of brotherly love, we meet all men, we accept all differences, we recognize the rights of all; and thus we work for the consummation of divine humanity.

CHARLES JOHNSTON.

THE PURPOSE OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

THE Society was founded in New York in 1875 and has, therefore, entered on the thirty-third year of its existence. Like many other similar bodies it has evolved and changed outwardly during its life period. It could hardly do otherwise, especially so far as its outer appearance and organization are concerned. The statement of its objects when founded would *appear* widely different from those which now exist. But when examined more closely the difference is not so great, for the main principles remain precisely the same: and the purposes with which it was formed remain unalterable: our knowledge of them deepens and as we grow our sense of the importance of them broadens and deepens. In the course of real evolution this is always the case, and the Theosophical Society is not a formation beyond natural law. It has its place in the evolution of the human mind, and it goes a step further—beyond the mind and intellect there is the heart and Soul, and it is with the evolution of these that the Theosophical Society is more particularly concerned.

The objects of the Society are three in number:

(1) The formation of a nucleus of Universal Brotherhood of Humanity without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste or color—*i. e.*, without any distinctions or separation whatever.

(2) The study of ancient religions, philosophies and sciences, and the demonstration of the importance of such study.

(3) The investigation of the unexplained laws of nature and the psychical powers latent in man.

These objects are similar to those of many societies. There are some societies which deal with psychic powers: many which deal with unexplained laws of nature: others which devote themselves to the study of religions, philosophies and sciences, both ancient and modern: and again there are organizations which profess to promote Universal Brotherhood. The Theosophical Society alone has all three. But its chief object—to which the others are subordinate—is that formation of a nucleus of the Universal Brotherhood of Humanity without any distinction whatever.

We may talk of an ideal of Universal Brotherhood; we may have a sentimental feeling that all human distinctions should be done away with; we may find the same in many of the religious and philosophical

systems—in Buddhism especially—but we do not know why. It is when we study the psychic powers—the higher psychic powers—and when we study the real root of religion, that we find Universal Brotherhood becomes a condition of the higher evolution and that it falls at once into its place as the necessary condition of existence of the higher humanity. And here we gain a glimpse of the real purpose of the Theosophical Society.

The evolution of a human being even physically is by no means a simple matter. Those who study biology, or the science of life, follow the evolution of very simple units—mere specks of protoplasm. As evolution proceeds, these gain in complexity or, rather, life is manifested in more complex forms. With this complexity comes a division of labour, parts taking up a special work but each devoted to the main object—the better interest of the unit complex being, the united life of which they form the various parts. The greater the unity of purpose, the greater the strength. The main principle which governs such evolution is the material one of the struggle for life.

But with this division of labour and the promotion of unity, there is manifested the evidence of what are called the psychological qualities. So much so that a distinguished Frenchman has written a small treatise on “the psychic life of micro-organisms.” A still further advance brings the mental qualities and the evolution of the human animal. Here it is shown that the promotion of the unit life (however complex) becomes enlarged. The unit being is now engaged not so much with the struggle for its own existence but, as Henry Drummond put it, not with the struggle for life, but with “the struggle for the life of others.” The principle of *self-sacrifice* for a higher ideal is introduced with what may be called the more distinctively human stage.

The unit being has its choice. It may either evolve merely as an animal with material aims in view, or as the distinctly human, with altruism and self-sacrifice as the guide to the evolution of character or, further, to the “immortal” qualities of the life of the Soul.

As said above, these are the distinctively human qualities and are the subject of that self-consciousness which all the philosophies have studied. For the most part no bridge hitherto passed the chasm between the material and the psychic—much less the spiritual. But studies were brought to our notice by Mme. Blavatsky which show that there is a continuity of evolution on three main lines—material, psycho-mental and spiritual, and these latter form a part of the “psychical powers latent in man.” This is the life and being of the immortal soul which truly is obedient to a nature and laws of its own: and from their very nature the manifestation of the soul, as evidenced by its powers, is well worth the study and investigation of humanity. “The proper study of mankind is man,” and the study of those powers of the soul which make man man,

is the proper sphere of his operation. This again is a part of the purpose of the Theosophical Society.

Madame Blavatsky in her books drew attention to the composition of the human being. Mr. A. P. Sinnett had also put forward a groundwork of similar origin, but Madame Blavatsky expanded this to a very great extent, showing that the principle of evolution ought to be applied in all departments of nature and that everything manifested is in obedience to this law. It was demonstrated that from the remotest ages of time there had been going on unbrokenly this continued "process of becoming" and that the various forms of religion and philosophy were but various statements of this fact as the common basis of life. Each form was a demonstration suited to the particular genius of the race in which it appeared. A part of the purpose of the Theosophical Society was to examine these and give to each its proper place in the evolution of humanity. In this way the Society would act as a sort of "spiritual exchange" and form a synthesizing point (in place of accentuating a separation).

Thus regarding religion as the obligation felt by the Soul to fulfil its own laws, we see the grouping around it of philosophy, of science, of ethics, of the entire moral sense of humanity, proceeding as a necessity from the manifestation of the soul under material and opposing conditions. In the evolution of the material universe there is, as shown, the gradual unfolding of the soul. That which is hidden, gradually comes to view. The life is manifested under material conditions, and gradually it is seen that life and soul are one: that life and soul gradually permeate matter. But history has shown us the internecine quarrels which have arisen around the consideration of such origins, of philosophy and religion. Thus the Theosophical Society puts forward the universal brotherhood of humanity as the essential condition under which such study and consideration shall take place so that each student has a perfect right to express belief and disbelief with equally perfect courtesy to and tolerance of a fellow student's belief. The Theosophical Society was founded for just such a purpose. To freely discuss and study precisely such philosophies, religions and sciences is to get closer and closer to the heart of life and is to evolve the Soul consciously and is the best means to cultivate the sense of Universal Brotherhood which is, as said before, an essential condition of the life of the Soul. The various religions depend on the existence of the Soul. The Theosophical Society has brought before us the *development* of the Soul and has also shown us that its increasing manifestation is the result of purposive culture and that such manifestation is the purpose of this evolution.

The various religions give a comparative history of the efforts in this direction. But, as each formulated into a creed and crystalised little by little, these efforts materialised externally and hardened. Each

sought permanence in its own form and defied the principle of progress and evolution. The principle of universal toleration in the search for Truth and in the unfolding of the Soul, is safeguarded only by the application of the ideal of Universal Brotherhood.

Thus Universal Brotherhood is a law of the Soul—but by no means necessarily of the body—as yet. With the increasing manifestation and evolution of the Soul, it will become so, but only as each human being devotes himself by discipline and culture to the fulfilling of the purposes of Soul.

Therefore the culture of all parts—of body, mind and Soul, is necessary to the fulfilment of being, the law of the Soul being the paramount law. It opens before humanity considerations of the most profound importance, for it shows that as there are species of all kingdoms below what is called the human stage, there are species also within and beyond the human stage. In the triple evolution there is the development of the merely animal man and of the intellectual man with all its powers of self-seeking and self-acquisition. The powers of the intelligence and of the lower psychic qualities may be devoted to that side—or it may be devoted to the higher side—to the Soul and its powers, in obedience to and by the cultivation of certain laws. Of these the law of self-sacrifice is one of the first in the promotion of unity. And then before humanity, open out enormous vistas of development and evolution which carry the Soul beyond the human stage into the “angelic” or “divine.” Of these “species” we do not know much, but at least there are the records of the Avatars and we find traces of the steps of those Elder Brothers of the human race who have stood as the guardian wall to humanity, keeping us from sinking too deeply into the grossness and materialism which are the standing temptation of our race when we devote ourselves to present conditions and lose sight of a higher ideal.

Thus the Theosophical Society has as its purposes:

- (1) A consistent purpose to be attained by concentration and effort.
- (2) Making us aware of most important, though unexplained laws of nature.
- (3) Making us aware of a triple evolutionary process—body, psycho-mental and Soul.
- (4) Giving us a rational view of the real importance of the study of religion, philosophy and science.
- (5) Educating humanity as to its real self and thereby starting the study of the laws of the Soul and its culture, Universal Brotherhood and all that it means, being the outer expression of one of the fundamental laws of the Soul.

ARCHIBALD KEIGHTLEY.

AN EVENT.

Fragments. By "Cavé."

Bhagavad Gita. "The Songs of the Master," translated with an Introduction and Commentary by Charles Johnston.

Talks on Religion. A Collective Inquiry, recorded by Henry Bedinger Mitchell.*

WHEN a Buddha is born, it is said, the earth trembles and quakes. So an Event may happen which will shake an oyster from its shell or an occasional contributor from nearly ten years of anonymity! The almost simultaneous publication of these three books, with the THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY as their common base and in a certain sense their synthesis, constitutes such an event. It marks an epoch. It blazons a fact.

"Keep the Link unbroken," was the last will and testament of H. P. Blavatsky, the founder of the theosophical movement in the nineteenth century. And it was understood that this meant the "link" between the movements of the past century and of this; so that when the guardians of the old Wisdom next send out a messenger, there may exist a vehicle, an organism, ready at hand to carry on to still greater perfection the work of the Theosophical Society. But "Keep the Link unbroken" meant very much more than that. Is not the spirit more than the letter? Of what use a Society unless it have a soul? And what is the "link" between man and the soul that is in him? "And he dreamed, and behold a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven: and behold the angels of God ascending and descending on it. And, behold, the Lord stood above it."

A strong link is made up of many strands, or, rather, of one central strand reinforced by others. The spirit, intellectually mirrored; an intellect, spiritually enlightened; an understanding, sympathetically comprehensive; a substratum, unweariedly responsive—all these and many other qualities will be found in a link of the right kind, and in the link which this Event evidences.

* * * * *

Undoubtedly first in significance is the *Fragments*, by "Cavé." At my own request it was given to me to review this little book—just one hundred sparsely filled pages. But after reading it twice, very carefully, it seems that not less than a year of constant study would make a review worth while. It is the revelation by a soul of the Light it has found on

* For further information see advertisement on the last page.

the Path. My belief is that for hundreds of years it will be read devoutly and with love by those who seek that Path.

It is not a book to compare with other books. But in more respects than one it should make a wider appeal than some of the greatest in our literature, dedicated, as this might have been, "to the Few." Those other books are like gems on a golden shield. This book contains similar gems, cut and polished by the same master hand, but set in jewels more personal—and the gold of the setting has been hammered on a single heart. In other words, the appeal is more immediate and direct. On the one hand you have Perfection: "This, O man, is that to which you may attain; that for which you should strive; that upon which the Great Ones stand." Here, you have a picture of the strife; of lessons learned; of help won, and of the generous response of those who live for no other purpose than "to succour and nourish like the heavens."

It will offend the creed of no one; and all who seek God; all who would serve man and who have realized that they can do this only with God's help, would gain by making this book their daily counsellor and friend. What more can be said? Of what use to praise its terseness of expression; its elegance of form (the Preface, presumably the last thing written, is incomparably beautiful). Why speculate as to the source of inspiration here or there? The spirit is the Spirit of the Lodge. Is not that enough? That the spirit is so perfectly revealed—yes, that is wonderful, and in that lies the real wonder of the book. Test it as you will: intellectually, it is clear and sound; morally, it rings true, without the blur of psychic or emotional alloy; structurally, its lines are fine and firm and noble. And it speaks to *you* of your own conflict; it reminds *you* of your own birthright; it revives in *you* your own Light. It is the actual experience of one who has fought and who still fights "the good fight."

To the writer, our thanks (surely the thanks of everyone who, whether absent or present, has had the love of this movement more nearly at heart than any other thing).

Among ourselves, congratulations and rejoicing. For this book is a proclamation, loud enough for all who have will to hear, that the link has been kept alive and vibrant, and that on the ladder raised to heaven the angels of God are still ascending and descending, and that "the Lord" still stands above it.

* * * * *

Next in order (for a reason to be mentioned later) is the *Bhagavad Gita*, translated, with an Introduction and Commentary, by Charles Johnston.

Mr. Johnston was Sanskrit Prizeman both at the University of Dublin and in the Indian Civil Service. So far then as the translation is concerned, it should be superfluous to say more.

Unfortunately, as some of Max Muller's *Sacred Books of the East* have demonstrated, a mere knowledge of languages counts for very little. To attempt a translation of the Buddhist *Suttas* without a sympathetic understanding of the older scriptures from which, in so real a sense, they sprang; to translate the *Gita* without an intimate acquaintance with the Sankhya and other systems which Krishna so luminously reconciles—is like accounting for Luther as an innovator from Mars, or explaining the mission of Jesus on the theory that Judaism never existed.

In the terms of the last simile, Mr. Johnston's Introduction and Commentary show that he has more than a knowledge of Greek: he knows the prophets and the traditions of the Jews down to their ultimate development among the Pharisees and Sadducees and Alexandrian Neo-Platonists. That is to say—although no student of our literature needs to be told this—he is on terms of friendly familiarity with the diverse schools of Indian thought which Krishna tried to unify and which the *Bhagavad Gita* co-ordinates. He knows the letter in order to preserve the spirit. Language is his means; never an end in itself.

From the first chapter to the last, the Commentary is consistent and vital. We have the gradual disclosure of a process, as orderly, as real, as the unfoldment of a flower. It is a process which we ourselves are undergoing. Each method of union—union by works, union by love, union by insight, as chapter follows chapter—is explained and practically applied. They are shown as interdependent, the one supplementing the other. No stage can be omitted—least of all that described in the first chapter, the title of which is "The Yoga of the Sorrows of Arjuna." For in that chapter we are reminded, not only that suffering is inevitable as the lower self rebels against the prompting to turn from the outer to the inner, from the transitory to the eternal; but that suffering is essentially remedial. It is the fool in us that shrinks from it and tries to escape. The knots of the heart must be untied, and when we lack the energy and devotion to untie them by force of our own, then Life, the great teacher, either breaks them or melts them with fire. At that point we have the choice, either to shrink, backward and out, or to follow Krishna's advice and move forward to victory.

Constantly we are referred, in the Commentary, to our scriptures of the West, where the same battle is described. This should help to make the book acceptable to many, whose minds, accustomed only to Christian terminology, are often bewildered and somewhat frightened by the unfamiliar symbolism of the East. In fact, there should be a large and steady demand for Mr. Johnston's translation. Not long ago, a friend in one of the bigger cities of the middle states, tried to purchase a copy of another and older translation, and found at all the book stores that they had "sold out." Some "New Thought" lecturer had just delivered a series of addresses on the subject (better than the average, it was said),

and, for a week at least, had made the *Gita* fashionable! This is not unusual, and readers of the *QUARTERLY* will be doing a public service if they will call the attention of their friends, of that and similar persuasions, to a work which is really indispensable to an understanding of Krishna's teaching. They may own half a dozen other translations, but will need this one more, rather than less, on that account.

The printing and binding of the book could not be improved, and the price would be impossibly low were it not that the author publishes for himself and thus saves the purchaser the usual large commission.

* * * * *

Last, there is the *Talks on Religion*, recorded by H. B. Mitchell. I was not able to read such of these "Talks" as appeared in the *QUARTERLY*. Reading them in book form they impress me as immensely valuable. It is not that they contain new teaching: it is that they tend to complete the old teaching by applying it synthetically and practically to views which, from any other point of view, would be considered hopelessly divergent.

Meetings were held for the discussion of Religion. Men took part in these discussions who are specialists in various branches of modern science and culture. The tendencies of some were frankly materialistic; of others, agnostic; of others, idealistic. And the Mathematician, the central figure, at whose rooms the discussions were held, was able in almost every case with masterly grasp and insight and tact, to suggest centripetal undercurrents, and if not actually to reconcile, at least to relate opinions which appeared to be flatly contradictory. Without a wide knowledge of the esoteric philosophy, this would have been impossible (a debt which is amply acknowledged). But, in similar circumstances, how few, if any, even with that knowledge, would not have found themselves engulfed in profitless controversy! Intellectual appreciation of the facts and arguments presented; intuitive perception of the tendencies which the facts and arguments concealed rather than revealed—more than this: a clear recognition that "there is no revelation but the ever-continuing," and that each participant must have a message unveiling some different aspect of the soul of things—all of these great gifts were necessary for the doing of what the Mathematician did.

"Christianity and Nature," "Evolution and Ethics," "Mysticism and Faith," "The Renaissance of Religion," "Has the Church Failed?"—were among the subjects discussed. The Historian, the Zoölogist, the Clergyman, the Biologist, the Pragmatist, as well as the Mathematician, the Author, and the Editor, were of those who took part. And they are not fictitious characters, but actual and very human persons. As you read, you wish there were more historians like "The Historian"; more bankers like "The Banker,"—particularly, for all our sakes, more clergy-

men like "The Clergyman"! For listen to some of the things he had to say:

"Christianity is not concerned with the dead, but the living. The essential teaching of Jesus is not that His body died to ransom us, but that His spirit lives to inspire us."

Again, speaking of the evil days through which Christianity has passed, and accounting for them to some extent as "the working out and purging of the race from its poison," he appealed to more than one of those present who had severely and justly criticized the Church:

"Why do not you scientists who preach the conservation of energy apply it? Why will you not see that the forces acting in men's minds and hearts must work outward to their inevitable conclusion? I can conceive of Jesus waiting through the centuries till this should have been accomplished, waiting and working for its accomplishment. And I can even believe that, whatever the human brain may have thought, the great Soul within foresaw all this from the beginning—foresaw the ages of misunderstanding before His mission would be fulfilled, before His spirit of love and of service would dwell universally in the hearts of those who profess Him, before he could 'come again,' no longer, perhaps, as a man among men, but as the Spirit of Man itself, animating and uplifting the race to knowledge of its divine Sonship."

From each participant something memorable could be quoted. The Zoölogist reminds us that "whatever is present in the highest organism *must* also have been present, and *always* present, in element, in the cells which compose it. The continuity of the germ plasm makes this certain." Again: "No one better than Clifford has insisted upon the absence of finality in one's system of thought, if growth in mental and intellectual respects is to continue, for only the plastic condition allows growth."

And this from the Pragmatist: "It is curious to note how often when men seek *forcibly* to alter a given condition they succeed only in re-establishing the content thereof in some new form or way. Again and again has this been proved in political history, where the tyranny of a king has been overthrown only to establish the tyranny of a mob; and it is equally marked in the history of ideas."

The Oxonian tells us, "The truth is that you do not gain men for a commanding idea, and mould them to it by making small demands upon them, but by making great demands." Even "The Youth" will arouse a responsive echo in more than one reader when he declares that for his part, whenever he feels particularly religious in Church, he gets up and walks out to enjoy the sensation more freely!

Naturally, to anyone who reviews, and is privileged to criticize at his leisure, there must occur many wise and brilliant things which might have been said—after the event. And perhaps this may prove not the least attractive feature of the book! It is noticeable, for instance, that

practically without exception the speakers adopted the post-Darwinian view of primitive man: that he was "little better than the animals," and that we can study him best in the modern savage. Renouvier, perhaps the greatest of French philosophers, has branded that dogma as a superstition—which, in the view of the esoteric philosophy, it undoubtedly is. In Professor Flint's *History of the Philosophy of History*, he points out of Renouvier that:

"He has always seen with exceptional clearness the inherent unreasonableness, so prevalent among scientists, of assimilating primitive man to a modern savage, and arguing directly from the latter to the former. Primitive man may have been superior to savage man, while yet destitute of advantages which the savage possesses. The primitive man, just because primitive, although endowed with a good intellect, heart, and will, could have no traditions, acquisitions, or habits. . . . You must strip your savage of all that he has inherited or acquired before you can get at anything primitive in him. But this means that you must take from him all the corrupt tendencies he has inherited, all the evil habits which he has formed, all the beliefs in which he has grown up, the language which he has learned, tribal customs and usages, etc. But when you have done all this, where is your savage? He is clean gone as a savage. There remains nothing of him but those rudiments of humanity which are common to him and to yourself. And these you must obviously study in yourself, seeing that it is only of yourself that you have direct knowledge, immediate experience. But the knowledge and experience of yourself must be so analyzed and generalized, that what is individual and peculiar, secondary and factitious in it, may be eliminated. The primitive man must be conceived of as a true and whole man, yet only as an abstract or generic man, without racial or individual determinations. . . . Thus conceiving of primitive man he (Renouvier) does not find it necessary to think of him as either originally good or originally evil, but only as innocent and peccable. . . . Analysis of the data of moral experience shows, he thinks, that it must mean that man instead of reflectively and voluntarily accomplishing a *possible ascent* in good from innocence to virtue, everywhere worked out a real descent from innocence to vice" (pp. 659-662).

It is surprising, also, that throughout the discussion of "Evolution and Ethics" (the third chapter), no reference was made by any of the speakers to Professor Huxley's remarkable essay under that title. This was due, perhaps, to the fact that Huxley was so widely misunderstood—even Spencer misunderstood him. Huxley's statement that "the ethical process" is in direct conflict with "the cosmic process" as a means of growth after a certain point of development has been reached, was taken to mean that he had in some way abandoned his earlier views and had been guilty also of a flagrant contradiction. And few of those who read

his Romanes Lecture when it appeared in 1893 have read his Prolegomena (of 1894) to that lecture, which precedes it in Volume IX of his "Collected Essays." The Lecture and the Prolegomena should be read together, and will then be found, in many respects, really illuminating. For few will deny that Huxley was above all things a great thinker.

Such wisdom after the event is rather cheap, however. It is contributed partly because it is supposed to be the function of the critic, when reviewing a book of this kind, to know better! But having done my duty to that extent, it may now be less questionably in order to appeal to all readers of the QUARTERLY to do their utmost to bring these "Talks on Religion" to the notice of their local newspapers for review, and to the notice also of their local clergy and literati. It will be good work done for our common cause.

* * * * *

Thinking once more of these books, after the reviews have been written, two other points appear as noteworthy. The first is that the message of each is human. And of all of H. P. Blavatsky's sayings, there is none that we can less afford to forget than this: "Keep your Theosophy human!" Academic dissertations on metaphysical subtleties; authoritative dicta on the nature of things unseen; elaborate explanations of unimportant correspondences—these things, though labelled theosophical, are perversions of the theosophic purpose. Not a hint of them is to be found in any one of these books. There is scholarship, but not scholasticism; mysticism, but not mystery; brotherhood, but not gush. The appeal is to the humanity in each one of us, and to the best in that humanity.

The second point is that these books, in the order in which the reviews have been arranged, curiously elucidate and promote the three objects of the Theosophical Society.

The principal aim and object of the Society is to form *the nucleus* of a universal brotherhood of humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste or color. The *Fragments* not only breathe in every sentence the ideal of brotherhood, but expound the only basis upon which true brotherhood can be founded—identity of Spirit and communion of soul.

The subsidiary (or supplementary) objects are, first, the study of ancient and modern religions, philosophies and sciences, and the demonstration of the importance of such study. The translation of the *Bhagavad Gita*, with the translator's invaluable commentaries, is a splendid illustration of how that object can best be promoted, and of how, properly understood, it furthers the cause of brotherhood.

The second of the subsidiary objects is the investigation of the unexplained laws of nature and the psychical powers latent in man. In times past it was thought that "psychical powers" must necessarily refer

to abnormal or phenomenal developments—to clairvoyance and similar faculties. But we have learned that this was quite a narrow view, and that “psychic” covers all the emotional activities, all the processes of the mind, all the reactions of the senses; and that the higher phases of each of these are latent in the vast majority of mankind. So *Talks on Religion*, which deals primarily with the unexplained laws of nature and with the cause and meaning and value of such phenomena as religious emotion, is in direct furtherance of the third object of the Society.

Trusting to memory only, it is doubtful if the word Brotherhood is mentioned in any of these books, not even in the *Fragments*, which has been referred to in that special connection. But how clear and unmistakable their message! Far more clear than by tiresome chatter of the word.

There was a Chinese sage, to whom went an inquirer, saying, “Tell me, I beseech you, about Brotherhood.” And the sage looked at him in gentle wonder, and answered: “My child, what do you mean? What new thing is this that the invention of man has sought out?” The inquirer was troubled. He knew much about Brotherhood, and had gone to the sage merely for finishing touches. Presently he went to another sage, great, but not quite so great as the first, or perhaps great in a different way. And to him he repeated his question and complained of the answer received from the other. The sage smiled. Then he said this: “Words are employed to convey ideas; but when the ideas are mastered, we forget the words. Blessed indeed to meet one who has forgotten the words! The Sage loves others, because he knows what they are. But if they did not tell him of his love, he would not know that he loved them; and when he knows it, he is as if he knew it not; when he hears of it, he is as if he heard it not. His love of others never has an end, and their repose in him is endless also. To the Sage, many things are One.”

And perhaps in this silence, this most effective silence, we have the clue to that which makes these books so human. Not only do they contain knowledge which we can use, daily and almost hourly; but it is presented without preaching. It is simply exhibited, and after looking at it we go away and preach to ourselves!

In any case, whether that explanation be accepted or not, the result is undeniably admirable, and, with the other features noticed (each reader will discover new ones), should give to the movement everywhere a wider scope and an added power, marking this year as a turning point, both of consummation and of far-reaching advance.

E. T. H.

INTERWOVEN.*

A VERY inadequate title for these letters from a son who has passed away, to his mother who is still in the flesh. They present the same curious mixture of the valuable and the worthless that we usually find in such documents, and the life of another state of consciousness as depicted in them differs more in degree than in kind from our own. The letters were written through a medium, her arm only being used for the transmission of words, and cover a period of about six years, ceasing with the death of the medium herself. Their genuineness is vouched for by the writer of the preface, Miss Sarah Louise Ford, of Boston.

The chief interest of the book lies in the development of the character and intellect, and even the style, of the son, Wadsworth Cecil, a young physician, who died suddenly of diphtheria shortly after he had begun to practise, and furnishes a remarkable instance of "a ruling passion (literally) strong in death." To a theosophist the letters go far to corroborate the idea of heaven or Devachan, as a dream-life wherein our strongest desires, our highest aspirations are fulfilled, and the greater part of the book describes as actually taking place many things which might have been merely a subjective vision. One of the most curious things in it is the intense interest of the young physician in everything related to his profession, and the progress that he seems to make in medical knowledge and skill. There are seven bodies, he says, all capable of separation, and even on earth it will not be long before they can be taken to pieces like the parts of a watch, and cleaned and repaired and put together again. As this has already been done here for the eye and the stomach, it was a pretty safe prophecy to make. He seems to confuse "body" and "shape," for he goes on to speak of his many shapes—a thought shape, a luminous shape, a spirit shape, etc. And again he speaks of the last body, which will be born into the seventh sphere, and contain all the lighted powers as organs. The uvula, he says, is a storage battery for the next body, and little coils of ganglia lie in every part of the physical body as preparations for the higher result. The study of the human body is the key to all knowledge. When ignorant people are taught more about their bodies, and the proper use of every ligament and tendon, valve and cell, they will understand the relation between mind and matter. Matter is the light of the mind in a denser condition. Everything seems to this student to be expressed in terms of light and

* Published by Geo. H. Ellis & Co., Boston.

electricity and vibration. He hardly knows what is meant by a cycle, he says, but he knows that certain seeds of powers which are left by adepts culminate and work into action among the people, and this gives a rise or lift to mind all through the kingdoms, not only in earth, but in the next sphere and the next. So there is constant progression in knowledge, and by and by what is now the lower mortal law will burst as a flower into the higher sense. He speaks many times of the storage in all the organs for the future body. "The potency of the future is as the meat in the nut." After the sixth sphere it is the power, not the organ, which is considered and used. When we understand all the organs, they will be raised into the glory of health, and in the seventh degree the white, spiritual-atomed being will occupy its body as a palace or mansion. There will be no need of the circulation of the blood, for the fire in the blood will have taken its place. Veins are the conveyors of magnetism and arteries of electricity, and when these two are as one in balance, there can be no disease. Again he writes:

"There are two ways of becoming immortal, either by overcoming the obstacles of life and making deposit of a strong-principled self, or by sinking back as a soul-seed into earth and back through the animals into chaos, becoming an element, and again starting with all heredity effaced, and almost as a new identity." But souls, he resumes, are never entirely lost after once having "acquired individuality." The doctrine of the development of the Soul is continually cropping up in these letters, though often very crudely expressed, as indeed is most of the book. In another letter the young physician says, "I don't wonder that it was said that Christ turned water into wine, for I find that the properties of all results lie in water. It is enough to say that what Christ did was not by a miracle, but by a natural law." Natural law also permits the development in the eye itself of far or near vision. "I saw how this might be done by certain loosening of small muscles and widening of others so as to give more space in the iris.* It is possible this could be attained upon earth if people believed it, or the eye-doctors could see the law."

And in another place Dr. Wadsworth says that when people are brought up from materiality into more refined conditions, there will be exceeding lightness of the human frame. The true man will be made up of sinews, nerves, cords and tendons, and the flesh which breeds disease will go down to animals and out. He speaks of the essence of fire, which refuses to run in flesh, but keeps to the nerves. And yet there is so exalted a nerve-state, that the fire even irradiates the outer self, unless the man carries too much fat.

* It is, of course, the shape of the eye-ball, not the iris, that affects the length of vision.

In the same letter he says the power of magnetism sent by the hand or the will, is to be a great force on the earth. Mind is in high action, and in less than twenty years it will be able to conquer any disease without medicine, save, perhaps, the very finest quality of some herb. The power of hypnotism will rule, and prevent pain of all kinds, even in operations.

Several times he speaks of sight as merging into feeling in the fifth world; "and the moment I feel, then I see, because every nerve sees. I know that in the physical body the nerves had eyes, only they were undeveloped. . . . As we progress, every nerve sees, and develops into what is called the sixth sense or intuition. . . . To see and hear exactly as we did on earth we must have the same apparatus, with the same vibrations, or else use what we call a medium to see and hear with. I can see my words as fire, and watch them glance along the nerves and come out at the end of the medium's pencil. But I do not see the marks nor the paper, which are in the outer world. Christ could turn water into wine because he could control every element. It is done on the principle that in the finer air all elements exist, or that all that composes the earth is elementally within the ether. All things contain a bit of all other things. . . . There is a great fact, that the moment the soul neglects any part of its mansion it begins to die. Body is a thing that has got to be tuned up in every minutiae, or it loses its sounds and its vibrations. . . . Father and I are learning the highest method of motion, higher even than rolling one's self in a fireball and willing the way to certain points. It is a simple infilling with desire to be at such a point and consuming the body, as it were, in the desire, and thus becoming entirely unconscious for one moment. It is an awful intensity, and could not be done by anyone on earth, for memory and every principle of self are dropped for a moment, and if the life-thread would not connect, then there would be loss of individuality. After sleep the soul easily catches the thread of life, because memory and nearly all the soul-forces remain attached, but when a soul drops all these, and remains entirely isolated for a moment, so as to overcome distance, then is the danger. Suppose I had lost myself and could not connect! Well, it must be learned if we would be in all parts of the kingdom at a moment's notice."

Many spheres are quite out of sight from earth, he says. "The planets are all earths, just as this one is, and belong to what we call borderland," a curious confirmation of the theosophical theory that all visible stars are on the same plane of matter as our world. . . . The flesh down here (*i. e.*, on earth) is water and pulp, but in the spirit it is light and fibre, like a spider-web or the filaments of a fine petal. In higher worlds the flesh is yet more spiritualised, being composed of ether and light. . . . I am a second body now, and my

second self is ten times more alert and light and youthful than the other. . . . There is a way, too, of living on, and shedding age by not dying, a kind of caterpillar condition. This is the old Rosicrucian system, and is done in caves and deep forests. When Jesus went up in the Mount to pray, he cast off his outer self, and renewed (his body) without dying, and so came down fresh and young. A great many do this. They are very wise, having known many generations. . . . Did you hear me when I said, No, I could not make shape yet? Possibly in time I could learn to put myself together, but hardly to look natural, I fear. You would not like to see me unless I could thicken to my former shape and face. This is only a chemical arrangement. But at present I have too much to do to try to form. It is not hard work, but a long process of affinity with like atoms—like modeling.”

Then he takes up the germ-theory again, and once more repeats that germs are live atoms. “They are builders and destroyers, the one pitted against the other, like all the opposites. If any one can find a way to increase the white corpuscles and set them against the red corpuscles, this would drive out disease. There are two sets of germs in a body, the spiritual or white (second body germs), and the material (or earth-body), red germs, and it is the red germs that begin to cause decay in whatever organ is used or exposed too much. And the white corpuscle germ if increased in numbers will stop that decay. The trouble is, that no one looks at it in this light, and so they don’t try those particular elemental extracts from roots, which will increase the white corpuscles, and thus eradicate disease from the red ones. The ‘gold cure,’ so-called, is somewhat successful for the very reason that it increases the white germs, and drives out the rot of liquor.” This is again quite on a line with theosophic teachings, which describe the white corpuscles—as indeed science has done—as the scavengers of the body, the devourers of the germs of disease. As early as 1846 Dr. Waller said that the white corpuscles were able to pass through the walls of the blood-vessels, and go all over the body, of which they are the sanitary police. And Dr. Andrew Wilson in 1893 said much the same thing. (*Lucifer*, Jan., 1894.) Theosophy adds to this the statement that the spleen is the reservoir of animal magnetism, and the original centre of the force which evolves the astral man. It would seem then, that to increase the number of white corpuscles, those “elemental extracts from roots,” of which Dr. Wadsworth speaks, should be directed to the spleen. But perhaps even more efficacious would be what he calls the main thing for doctors, and in fact for everybody, to raise the tone of the soul, to expel fear, deceit, idleness, ambition and all evil forces. Where would the old notion of the spleen as the source of melancholy come in then? There is a point of mind that can be reached, he says, where nothing distresses. It corresponds to insanity. “Insanity is the unconscious depth, while what I

mean is a conscious height, a peculiar oneness with the divine law, so that the soul can overlook all obstacles and know their reasons."

Again he speaks of the use of certain herbs as so dilating the eyes that they acquire telescopic powers, and worlds can be seen at immense distances. Also, that the ear-drum can be excited to such a degree that one can hear the past, as in a shell, the revealments of history at the time the shell was forming. . . . "An old Egyptian told me that the small efforts and longings of people to see or hear or understand were all as dim prophecies of the future unfoldment."

I might go on much longer with the plucking of flowers from this garden of another world. I have abstained from gathering weeds and thistles, for those we can find everywhere, nor has it seemed best to quote the descriptions of celestial mansions and household conveniences and curious contrivances of all sorts. It has been pointed out to me that the "spheres" and planes spoken of by the young doctor were all subdivisions of the astral plane, and that probably he had not got as far as Devachan at the time of writing. Also that many things said by him as to conditions in the astral and physical bodies, while absurd in the eyes of a scientist, are quite right when read as he wrote them, in the language of another sphere of thought. Whatever we may think of this explanation, it would certainly be well to look at the book from the writer's point of view, for nothing does more to widen one's mental horizon than to be forced sometimes to take another's point of view instead of our own. It lifts us out of our ruts, it compels us to see that there are many things in heaven and earth not yet formulated in our philosophy, and many, many misconceptions and errors that we have yet to correct. The great thing is to keep an open and unprejudiced mind, and to be ready to receive new ideas, however strange, and as strangers, give them welcome.

Above all let us realise, at least, that we have infinite fields of Knowledge still to explore, and that much of our progress consists in an ever-increasing ability to slough off the trammels of our old intellectual skin, and be ready for the new. Walt Whitman said this many times, but never perhaps more beautifully than in these lines:

"This day before dawn I ascended a hill, and looked at the crowded heaven,
And I said to my Spirit, *When we become the enfolders of those orbs,
and the pleasure and Knowledge of everything in them, shall we be
filled and satisfied then?*
And my Spirit said: *No, we but level that lift, to pass and continue
beyond.*"

KATHARINE HILLARD.

THE PRESENCE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.*

THE first fact about Lent is that it is a time for repentance. And the first fact about repentance is that in repenting of anything we do or feel, we "think better of it," as the phrase is. It is because we see the better that we despise the worse. Mere lamentation or penitential exercise over sin would be vain regret. It is from the vantage-ground of something sound and strong, reached somehow in spirit if not possessed in habit, that we look down on weakness for what it is, that we see it with fit feelings in its own ugly colors; and seeing our weakness for what it is, is another name for repentance. Lent is a summons to repentance, and so it is a summons to the best in us to rise up, and look about on whatever else is in us with the look of understanding and domination.

So Lent reminds us of that strange phenomenon, the rise of the better and stronger in us. It seems naïve to call it strange, this subject of prayer and hymns and a million discourses. But rightly looked on it is strange. The man is not all of him there at any moment. There is more of him as it were, in hiding. This is, of course, not always a matter of wrong and right doing. Now he is stolid and tongue-tied, though he knows there is something in him to say. Then somehow "a bolt is shot back somewhere in the breast" and he can speak out what he feels. Now the day is dull to him; business is tedium; good old friends have worn off their novelty a bit too much, their friendship seems to have grown threadbare from too much contact, he knows what they are going to say and the other thing they do not say, for a reason; the family is touched with staleness; and the great enterprise in front fades a little from its seductive brilliancy too. Then the touch of life comes upon him, something happens to *strike* him, as we say, it strikes fire from him, his nature ignites, and in the glow all those things light up again. Now he is weighing some trespass or neglect of others, weighing it fairly according to his knowledge, with annoyance but with justice, and reckoning how warm or cold or cool his own bearing should be. Then from somewhere comes a wave that lifts him where he can only give and ask nothing, and through him the wave rolls on, to the trespasser, or *not* to the trespasser, but still rolls on. Now he is busy at a work that enlists all his ardor; till suddenly it occurs to him that what is beckon-

*A Lenten Address delivered at the Church of the Ascension, New York.

ing him from in front is a vision of himself when he shall have succeeded, become an admirable creature indeed in the eyes of all around; it occurs to him that after all that was not exactly the object of the work, that he would be unwilling to admit it to anyone as his own object; that a sort of fraud lurks in his ardor; and then he works more intelligently because the work's essential object becomes his own.

In such transformation perhaps it seems as if the chief agency was some chance reminder. The reminder may be there as often as you choose, but it would be impotent to work a change if there were not something within to be called forth. Without that the reminder would call in vain. What these instances attest is the fathomless resource within, true though it be that it must be called forth, and called not once or twice. We experience in ourselves in every subject of life what we feel to be meaner and what we feel to be greater. It is the greater that we should like to put in power and in command. We cannot do so by a mere edict of the will. We cannot do so, because our mere conscious will does not reach directly down into the deeps of being where our hidden strength resides. Our ordinary conscious selves are not long enough of arm, or strong enough of hold, to stretch down to the bottom of that teeming darkness under them and grope and seize and drag forth to open expression all that may be there. Indeed there is no bottom, no limit. "We are open on one side," as the greatest of American thinkers has said, "to all the attributes of God." "There is no bar or wall in the soul where man the effect ceases and God the Cause begins. The walls are taken away." Subtly commingling with ourselves and ready if we open to it to flood the flats of life is that fresh stream of potential good, of gracious, happy inspiration, flowing from out of sight. I say what we can do is to call upon it and open to it, to know it for God in us and pray that it may grow more.

"They said unto Him, we have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." That may almost stand for the state of mind of a whole body of educated men amongst us. To them the existence of the Holy Spirit is at best a subordinate and inconspicuous item in a questionable theology. In truth it is the nearest fact of all religion. To prove its existence—that means nothing at all but (as the word prove once signified) to *test* its existence. "The influence of the Holy Spirit," writes a literary critic of eminence amongst us, "is a matter of actual experience, as solid a reality as that of electro-magnetism." I am not in the least concerned here to draw a line nicely between natural and supernatural. I have had enough of the philosophical intellect's issue of an injunction against all religious experience until the long hearings in its litigation are over; like a court of chancery wearing out the life of natural heirs before it duly divides and delivers to them their property. The answer to all courteous indifference and all dilatory philosophy is,

God the Holy Spirit is met in prayer. Turn to the Most High within you, turn to the blessed in inward experience, worship it, open to it, and make it prevail. For the rest, conduct your philosophy apart, in such time as your life may grant you for it.

The sense of the presence of the Holy Spirit within us is power. If it is a moment for action we can spring into the thick of it, as if flung from the hand of God. We can fight in the thought that He is in us, looking through our eyes, and wielding our arm. If it is a moment for patience, we can persist and endure with something of the endurance of a tool; for a tool may be broken but it does not grow tired. This Presence too is intellectual power, it is wisdom. The mind is not a perfect instrument till it is at one with itself, till the man is single-minded. Reverently giving entrance to the Holy Spirit, we give up the key of every chamber of the brain, that our utmost intelligence may be at the service of the One that now takes command. We are wiser because we are not distracted. We are wiser too, because we see from a higher place, looking down from above, commanding more things and their proportions. From the same source comes moral power. We think many a thought that we should be loath to speak aloud, but to begin to live our inward existence in this Presence, realized—that means to transform the very mood and mind itself. "Eat, even when you are alone," it has been said, "as if you were at the table of a king." Surely it will make a difference in the thoughts of our most private consciousness to become aware that we are in the intimate presence of the King of Kings.

The sense of the presence within us of God the Holy Spirit is relief. It is the sense of a supremacy. The narrower self may let the reins go to the higher power. So long as the decision is given by the best we know, we are at rest. Better we cannot do. The questionings and apprehensions of the narrower self are superseded and may cease. This is the meaning of Dante's words, "in His will is our peace." Utterly to commit ourselves to the ideal, the Living Ideal, One within us, is to forestall bewilderments and trepidations. It is to reach security. It is to rest in the Lord. The fact that He is Lord within us means our rest. Relief comes with unity, and in this first and simplest way the Holy Spirit is the Comforter.

It seems as if many Christians did but half learn the Christian thought. They learn that of conscience, of heart-searching and self-criticism, but not that of the peace which passes understanding. They think in Lent of penitence, but not always that really to repent, to see what is low in its true colors, means a change of will, re-union with the Perfect Will, forgiveness which takes away sin, and which strangely misses of its effect if it does not calm and lift and poise. The sorrows of Lent are means, they must be tasted to the full, but the sooner they

bring us to the end for which they exist, the better have they served. Christianity is a religion of sorrow just so far as it makes us see sorrowful things as they really are. But it makes us look at them that we may mend them, that we may bring happiness and bring it in ourselves.

This Presence which can nerve and clarify and calm can also aggrandise life. The Holy Ghost is thought of as a power in one's own being alone, but it is also, if one may venture to put it so, a social fact. The unrevealed Perfect is in the man we talk to, as well as in ourselves. I have listened to my teacher too well not to know that there is more than one self in a man to be addressed. What if we should address this deepest in him? Or, if we feel it presumption to speak to that latent Spirit in words, at least we can be mindful that it is there. "Honor all men," runs the text. "Have reverence for all," said St. Francis. To remember the Presence is to fulfill these sayings. We see the faults of our friends and the monotonous dinginess in human nature all too well as we grow older. And yet, "there is no bar or wall in the soul where man the effect ceases and God the Cause begins. The walls are taken away." To the discerning eye, human personality is translucent, and the glory of God shines through. The persons we know, seen in their deepest individuality, take for themselves the dignity of a throng of strong and diverse spirits, ranging up as if in the courts of Heaven, toward the light that burns above. The miracle of their transfiguration is accomplished. For it is part of the secret of worship to triumph over the commonplace, to enhance life and transfigure men.

DICKINSON S. MILLER.

THE RELIGION OF THE WILL*

THE WILL IN THE BODY.

III. THE CREATIVE WILL IN MAN.

We have studied the will in two great realms which are common to man and his cousins the animals: the realm of the search for food, and the realm of race continuance through reproduction. In general, we have found that, in both these realms, life rests on a series of quite definite exercises of the will, as definite as that of which we are conscious, when we lift a book from the table, or when we rise and walk round the room. It is well, at such a point as this, to lift a book, or to walk round the room, just to remind ourselves of what the will really feels like, in operation. Otherwise, we may be muddled by metaphysical unbelief.

Life rests on these innumerable acts of will. In the one case the result is the continuance of the individual who, if he ceases to eat, will in due time cease to live. And in general we may say that the will, stimulating the search for food, thereby stimulates to the conquest of space, setting the seeker a-roaming over the wide face of the earth. In the other, the will, promoting race continuance, with all the sacrifice this implies, prompts also to the conquest of time, for through reproduction each race does in a certain sense bridge over time and become immortal. The conquest of space; the conquest of time; these are, if we look at it in a large way, the fruits of the will. Life thus rests on innumerable acts of the will. On what do these rest?

When we considered the wonderful and pathetic family of moles, which set out westward from the Ural mountains millenniums ago and burrowed as far as Britain and Brittany but failed to reach the promised land of Ireland, we saw that there was a wonderful unanimity between them, though they had never met and consulted together in earthy parliaments; a oneness of will that has lasted through ages and has shown itself more steadfast than the Roman Empire, or the feudal system, or representative government. In this greater single will their individual wills rested. In obedience to it they exerted their own energies and burrowed ceaselessly. So this great will, working through the entire mole community, wrought its victory over space and a like victory over time. And as it is with the moles, so is it with all beings. Each has its definite power to will or to abstain. Each can eat or not eat, drink or not drink, as he wills, like the horse in the proverb. Yet around and above these individual wills is a larger will, and the small wills are strong only as

*Copyright, 1908, by Charles Johnston.

they rest in that. And that great will seeks, and in a measure gains, the victory over space and the victory over time, guiding material life until it covers the whole earth and making it, through the animal world, in a certain sense immortal.

So far we have gone by methods as safe, as plodding, as those of the mole himself. But now we bid him farewell. We must transcend him, leaving him behind, and entering a region which belongs peculiarly to man.

There are said to be certain ants in Texas which more than merit the eulogy of King Solomon. I believe Mr. Darwin is responsible for the story that they plant seeds and gather the harvest. Perhaps they do. But if they do the exception is only the more striking. For in general we may say that only man uses his will creatively on other living things. Many creatures, all, indeed, use their wills to act on other living things. The cow crops the grass. The tiger gathers in the cow. But this is destructive, not creative; and there lies the great difference. Man acts creatively. Man exercises the creative will.

What primitive man really was like, no anthropologist knows. All that is so long ago that the record is illegible. But we can say, with some confidence, that certain rude races do certain things at the present day, and that there are gradations from their doings, up through a whole range of improvements, until we come to ourselves and our high perfections. After the stage of killing game for food—which, curiously enough, breaks out again in our own aristocracies—we see that one of the first meliorations is the domesticating of wild animals to be servants or companions to man. And we see another thing, the significance of which is immense. We see that, in every case, the animals thus taken under the wing of man begin to undergo a change. Let me illustrate this by a conspicuous instance. Birds of different kinds lay eggs in differing numbers, some less, some more. Those whose nests are well-guarded, or inaccessible, lay only one or two, as do the eagles on their mountain peaks. Others, like the pheasants and partridges, which nest on the ground, lay a good many, perhaps a round dozen. The reason is that they are much more likely to be destroyed, so that the number is a kind of insurance for the species. If a partridge rears two broods in a year this would make two dozen eggs to the credit of her housekeeping. But the average of bird life is much lower, only five or six eggs a year. Now for the creative will of man. By careful selection he has developed the common barnyard fowl until a good hen can lay not two dozen but two hundred eggs a year, something that Nature unaided never would have accomplished. So that man has not only domesticated the hen but has endowed her with properties she never possessed, and never would have possessed, in wild nature.

With dogs the result has been similar but more picturesque. There

are a hundred kinds of dogs, from the huge St. Bernard to the tiny Mexican, each with some special feature or character; some of them developed in scent, some in strength, some in sagacity, but in all cases something produced which Nature did not produce, and in all probability never would have produced. So with horses and cattle. In each case we have added something to Nature, differentiating the huge, elephantine dray horse from the almost antelope-like thoroughbred; or the delicate-tinted Jersey on the one hand and the sturdy short-horn on the other.

But man's miracles in the vegetable world are even more wonderful. We have all been asked of recent years to admire the works of Luther Burbank, and very wonderful they are without doubt. But he is only doing what has been done for countless centuries, since the dawn of man's wonderful day. Take, for example, the huge cabbage that one sees at English flower-shows, an immense green sphere of close-packed leaves, weighing as much as a sheep. It has been developed, by minute gradations, from a wild plant by the seashore. Or take the rich-hued, round apples, each with its peculiar aroma, that one sees at the same shows. They have all come from the small, bitter crab-apple, which still spreads over the Siberian hills. With wheat, the mystery, the miracle, is even greater, for it is by no means easy to say with precision what the predecessor of wheat was, or whence comes this wonderful possession, the veritable staff of life of our race. The ancient Egyptians declared that wheat was a divine gift, bestowed upon man by the godlike Osiris; and ever since his day there has been something sacramental in this golden grain. And so we might go on, enumerating practically all the plants in our vegetable garden, and showing that in no case do they remain as Nature left them; all have been made over again by the creative will of man; endowed with new properties, given new forms, developed in new directions, made something more, and something better, than Nature made them; or, in some case, turned into phantastical directions into which Nature could never have turned them.

This last point, the total deviation from Nature, may well be illustrated by the banana and the rose. The bananas which we are accustomed to see on the pushcarts of Italians, or suspended amid groceries, are by no means wild, nature-grown fruit, though most of us may think them so. There is a genuine wild banana, and it has seeds as large as chestnuts, seeds that are perfectly fertile, as are the seeds, let us say, of the pine or beech, whose seedlings we see everywhere through the woods. But the banana we know is practically seedless; it is the prehistoric antetype of the seedless orange or the seedless grape, which are nine-days' wonders of our generation. But who first grew the seedless banana, it is beyond the wisdom of the wise to say. The memory of man runneth not to the contrary. And so with the rose, such a double rose as the far-

famed American beauty, or the Gloire de Dijon, or Maréchal Niel, or the other fair blooms that the poets have celebrated. Strictly speaking these lovely flowers are unnatural, even morbid. Nature never produced them; Nature could not have produced them; Nature could not preserve them to the second generation if man ceased to play Providence to the roses.

The development of the double rose is as follows: It comes, of course, from the single rose, the wild briar, which is spread through the greater part of the northern hemisphere. The wild briar, whether white or pink, has five heart-shaped petals, and these are set round a mat of gold, made up of the pistils and stamens, the reproductive parts of the blossom. It seems likely that these pistils and stamens are specialised leaves; that natural selection has by slow and infinite gradations, shaped them to their present form and purpose from some such form as the ferns still show, a leaflet whose under side is covered with spores. But be their origin what it may, it is certain that the pistils and stamens have a tendency to run down hill, to degenerate, to return to their earlier shape, as leaves, or petals. And this degeneration seems to take place through overfeeding, through a certain rank luxuriance of soil or some like cause, which coarsens the life of the plant and degrades its vitality. This is exactly what has happened to our much-admired roses. The former reproductive parts, the pistils and stamens, have degenerated into leaves and now supply the extra petals of the double rose. The same is the case with a great many artificially double flowers, such as double rhododendrons, double azaleas, ranunculuses and ever so many more. The rose has sacrificed use to beauty. To be more precise, we have forced it to sacrifice the future to the present, to lose the reproductive power, in order to gain additional petals and so make a finer show. It has gained the richness of velvety beauty that countless poets have sung, but in gaining beauty it has become a helpless parasite on man, unable of itself to continue its species; seedless, propagated artificially by budding, by grafting a rose-shoot on the still vital stem of a wild briar; or, more simply, by the setting of cuttings in rich earth, as fuchsias or geraniums or carnations are multiplied.

So that it is in reality no compliment for the poet to say that his love is like the red, red rose. Did he but know it, he is saying the equivalent of this: my love is fair to look upon, but she is an unnatural being; she has sacrificed one of her noblest powers to mere outward show; she is no longer able to live the free life of Nature, but has become a parasite, dependent on man for artificial continuance. Surely this were a simile more befitting a Sonnet to a Suffragette, a creature who has stepped from her true place, and is mimicing the activities of a different being.

Be this as it may, it is certain that plants like the rose and the

banana are not Nature-made but man-made. They represent the power of man's creative will, producing something which Nature has never produced; more than that, something Nature would have been quite incapable of producing; something Nature could not even sustain, were man's hand withdrawn. For there would be no second generation of roses and bananas, if they were left to run wild. Seedless, they must be artificially continued; they are man's creation, dependent for their very life on man.

We might well extend this view of the matter and recount the activities of man's creative will in the inanimate, as well as the animate world; showing how man has gradually mastered all kinds of materials and in many directions has produced things that Nature never produced, such as fire-baked bricks, or china, or colored silks, or metallic sodium, or calcium carbide, to mention only a few that float on the surface of memory. And even more wonderful are man's doings when we come to the imponderables—as it used to be the fashion to call them—the naked forces, like chemical affinity, electricity, and now ether-waves. Man has ceaselessly advanced from the coarser to the finer, gaining mastery over ever more recondite realms of power. Let us illustrate this in a simple way. Of old, when we wanted light by night, we used to kindle a fire of sticks to set some solid material blazing. Then came oil-lamps, fed with oil pressed from the olive, or the cocoanut, or, later, the refined blubber of whales, or the mineral oil of the petroleum wells. This in turn gave place to gas, first distilled from coal and later got by tapping the reservoirs of the earth. Solid, liquid, gaseous; this was the succession of our illuminants. And now we have broken through from the realm of matter to the realm of force. We light our houses by electricity, carried hither and thither through our rooms along slender wires, without the transfer of any matter at all. The torch, the lamp, the gas-jet, the electric light; there is a brief epitome of man's victory over Nature, from the coarser to the finer realms. And we have every reason to believe that the progress hitherto made is but a little part of an infinite journey, the small surveyed portion of a great divine road, whose further spaces advance to the infinitudes.

So little man is a veritable creator. Taking the endless treasures that benign Nature offers him, he has set to work with his creative will, and has created, truly created, an over-Nature, a new and additional creation overlaid upon the first creation; shaping anew many of Nature's forms, whether of beast or bird, pigeon or horse or dog; remoulding the vegetable world with like miraculous power, and forming such wonders as the prize cabbage, with its huge sphere of green or purple; the Brussels sprout, a kind of Socialistic cabbage; the seedless banana, and the lovely but unnatural rose, which has lost sex to gain mere outward splendor. Everywhere throughout the inhabited continents is man's creative work;

his super-creation overlaid on Nature's handiwork. The total sum of it is immense; its variety is infinite; its relation to man's life at all points miraculous.

Have you ever considered the law underlying a Grecian temple, with its marble columns? The line which runs up the centre of each column, whence comes it, think you? From the centre of the earth! In each and every case, if you followed backward and downward the column's line, you would reach the world's centre; and it is in virtue of this that the column stands, erect and firm, able to bear the weight of the beautiful portico or pediment. It is the same with every wall or tower or human building. It rises upright from the earth, along an invisible line springing forth from the earth's centre; and only because it follows this invisible but potent line, does the tower or building stand. So is it with all man's creative work. While he follows out the invisible lines of Nature, he can create practically whatever he will; can mould form after form; can even produce forms that are morbid and unnatural, the result of stereotyped degeneration.

But the point I wish to make at this stage is this: that this wonderful, ample and varied over-creation with which man has decked the once wild face of the earth, is a tremendous cumulative testimony to man's creative will, consciously exerted, toward quite consciously discerned ends, through countless generations. It seems to me that we have here a conclusive argument against determinism, which has hitherto been overlooked. If we have no true free will, if we act simply from inherent impulse, along predetermined lines, how comes it that we have done such an infinite work for which there was no provision in Nature, which Nature never could have done, and which Nature could not maintain for a single generation, were man's overruling, creative will withdrawn? I believe that the true deduction from the mass of evidence here marshalled is this: that man possesses genuinely creative power; that he can create, just as Nature has created, producing forms that Nature would never have produced; and that, therefore, we are fully justified in saying that the creative will in man is of the same nature as the Will that made the worlds.

CHARLES JOHNSTON.

AT THE GATE OF DEATH.

ONE of the most interesting signs of the times is the increasing tendency of conservative thinkers to feel their way cautiously into what seems to them a novel line of thought, but which to those accustomed to theosophical teachings, appears to be a very slight deviation from the ordinary conceptions of life and death. It is nevertheless always an advantage to see what we call truth, and perhaps even self-evident truth, put in a new and tentative form, so that we suddenly awake to the perception of possible outlines that we had never seen before, as when a much-belated spring like the present gives one glimpses of rugged mountain sides and abrupt cliffs through the delicate tracery of the half-opened leaves, that had been hidden in other years by the luxuriant foliage of summer.

The more Mr. Arthur Benson writes, the closer he seems to come to theosophical ideas without actually expressing them, so that he reminds one of the blind man in a game of blind-man's buff, who comes straight toward one for a breathless instant, and when just within touching distance suddenly dashes off to the other side of the room, quite unconscious that a captive was so nearly within his grasp.

Mr. Benson's recently published book (by G. P. Putnam's Sons), is in the form of a diary, and is founded on an experience—not so rare perhaps as the author seems to think—of two returns from the very gate of death. The first time it was an accident, a fall from a tree, that brought him almost within the dark portals, and some months afterwards an attack of pneumonia and heart failure very nearly swept him once more out of our world.

The accident that had such disastrous results occurred on January 27th, and had the rather singular effect of obliterating not only all recollection of the unconscious interval of a week or more which followed it, but also all memory of the five days preceding it, even when confronted with the careful record of them in the diary. The writer feels that in sleep there is "a sort of subterranean consciousness," but that death, by closing all the avenues of sensation, might leave one for a time in a state of perfect isolation. "I have always believed in the preservation of identity," says Mr. Benson, "and I have sometimes wondered whether the reason why the spirits of the dead have no power of communicating with the spirits of the living may not be that the soul that has suffered death may have to learn its new conditions," just as a child born into this world does. But then the terrible question arises—why do we not become more conscious of the presence of the

spirits of the dead when some time has elapsed after death, and they have learned these new conditions?

Mr. Benson speaks of his slow and interrupted return to consciousness, and the first real perception of objective realities, when he saw his sister sitting by his bed, and she asked him if he knew her. "Yes," he said, "of course I know you; but I am not sure that I know who I am." He says this seemed to him a very witty repartee at the time, at which he laughed in a feeble and drowsy way. After that, the glimpses of life became more frequent, but the one overpowering desire was to be let alone. He would not allow himself to groan, for fear that his brother and sister would be summoned, to kneel beside him, to pray over him, perhaps to touch his hand. How wise are the teachings of theosophy, that bid the parting soul be left in undisturbed peace during those solemn moments when it is withdrawing itself from the body!

"It had always seemed to me a wanton cruelty," says Mr. Benson, "to fill the room of a dying person with relations and friends, when he could not remonstrate or resist. If the sense of privacy dictate that one should lie down to sleep and rise and dress again alone, it had always seemed to me that when the spirit was about to lay aside its human vesture for ever, it might at least demand to suffer death in solitude." Then he fell asleep, and when he awoke he was still in the body, but nothing left to him but just life. He desired nothing and feared nothing, but merely watched life as a man might watch an expiring flame, wondering whether it would go out or not. One thing seemed to him certain, that there is no terror in death to the dying. This is an almost universal experience—there may be dread of suffering, sorrow at leaving one's dear ones, but to the actual passing out of life, only a quiet indifference, a blunting of the sensibilities, a floating away on a calm tide of sleep.

When the well of life began slowly to fill, says Mr. Benson, the deep, real, vital thoughts came back first. The memories that he treasured then were the thought that he had made a few happier, that he had done a few kindnesses, that he had won some love, nothing else seemed to matter. And here again we have the same note struck that filled the other messages we have read lately purporting to come from another state of being, the *Letters of Julia, Interwoven*, the *Gray World*, and many others, all proclaiming with one accord that *Love* is the all-important thing.

When the all absorbing and terrible clinging to mere life subsided, two emotions came back to our writer, the first, a tender consciousness of the love he held most dear, and with it a wide love for the whole beautiful world, for the little race of men, faring on so patiently to the unknown goal, followed by an intense sense of God and His fatherly nearness to him, that swallowed up all other thoughts.

Then when the high tide of this universal love had subsided, he began to put together the lessons he had learned at the Gate of Death. And here he comes again very close to theosophical teachings, and states perhaps the strongest of all arguments for continuous life. "Just as I cannot conceive of the annihilation of existing matter, neither can I conceive of the annihilation of what I call vital force and consciousness. The life that animates matter is to my mind fully as real and actual as matter itself. As to consciousness, that is a different question. . . . It may be that consciousness is dependent upon the union of life and matter; but I believe with all my heart in the indestructibility of life, and I thus believe that when I die, when my body moulders into dust, the life that animated it is as much in existence as it was before. . . . It may be that the vital force which I call myself may be distributed again among other lives, it may be that it is a definite and limited thing, a separate cell or center; and thus it may hereafter animate another body—such things are not incredible. But in any case it is all in the hands of God."

Is it any less in the hands of God if we separate the vital force from the "I am I" consciousness, the intellectual soul from the emotional soul, the individual Ego from the personality? This is one of the many places where the writer seems to skim over the clear depths of thought like a swallow that dips a hasty wing and is off again, before one realizes that he is there.

Mr. Benson comments at some length upon the doctrine of probation, which some think explains everything in the nature of sin and suffering in this world, but which he says with swift decision, "does not explain a thousand things." He confuses continuously probation with punishment—surely a man may be *proved* by happiness, good fortune, health of body and mind, as well as by the reverse of all these. We are reduced to assuming, he says, that there must be a new life to redress the balance of the old, because if there were not another life the inequalities, the injustices of this life would be intolerable. Well, why not? Why should we not assume that not one but many lives are given us in which to work out our salvation, and believe, too, that the whips which scourge us, the fetters that bind, were forged by our own hands in the many lives that lie behind our present consciousness? But with the keys of Karma and reincarnation in his hands, with some little knowledge of what he calls "the Oriental doctrine of metempsychosis" he is nevertheless confronted by the, to him, insurmountable difficulty involved in the death of babies and little children, and all the consequent sorrow of their parents. But there is no pain, no suffering which would not become bearable, he is sure, could we look forward with a certain hope to the possibility of feeling ourselves one with God, and God one with us.

Much that we can heartily agree with, is in Mr. Benson's comments upon our funeral ceremonies, which he calls utterly heathen and barbarous things, and for children especially, a revolting cruelty. "For them at least death should be veiled in the same mystery as birth." Not till the body is laid in the ground, would he have any solemnity or function, and then he would have a service as beautiful and hopeful as possible, with the mind directed to the thoughts of life and the mystery of the future.

One of the strange things about our view of the future life and those who have gone before, is our constant tendency to think of them as changed, and to feel that we should regret that change. Mr. Benson confesses that it would be repellent to him, but that he cannot believe that the essential differences of human beings would cease with death. Some tinge of humor he hopes will survive, and though many of his best and dearest friends are clergymen, he would be sorry to have to think that the after-life was going to be run, so to speak, on strictly clerical lines.

Outside of the thoughts I have taken up as more or less like our own, there are many wise and beautiful sayings in this book, and some exquisite bits of description, sometimes perhaps, a little too exquisite. The temptation of work, he says, "is to sacrifice kindly and generous intercourse with others to it. Christ rather indicated that life should be lived on the simplest lines; and if we were only content to do that, what a network of small social chains and ties would be immediately unloosed! I have learnt that one perceives things by resting, in a way in which one does not always perceive them by working." And again, "the light by which we walk is within us, rather than outside of us; and it is in our souls that we must seek for it, rather than in any external illumination."

Mr. Benson is not only a mystic, but a poet, even if he does not write in verse, and his prose sometimes runs in perfect rhythm, as in this line: "charged with sweet secrets, musical with dreams." And very beautiful is his description of a dim orange sunset, that concludes his book. "Just at that moment over the stream sailed a great heron, with curved wings black against the sky, dipping and sinking with a deliberate poise to his sleeping-place.

"So would I that my soul might fall with a glad and contented tranquillity to the shining waters of death; to rest while all is dark, until the dawn of that other morning. . . . God rests, but ceases not. Through day and night alike beats the vast heart pulsing in its secret cell. Through me, too, throbs that vital tide. What pain, what silence shall ever avail to bind that mighty impulse, or make inanimate whatever once has breathed and loved?"

KATHARINE HILLARD.

ON THE SCREEN OF TIME.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL PROGRESS.

THE recent growth of the Protestant Episcopal Church in tolerance and its gradual unfolding of the Christian spirit and ideal, found fortunate expression at the Triennial Convention which was held at Richmond last autumn. Three hundred years had passed since the founding of the first Episcopal Church in this country, on the James River, not far from Jamestown. The Triennial Convention constitutes the legislative body of American Episcopalianism. The committee of conference, by a large majority, passed a resolution amending Canon XIX so as to read as follows:

"No minister in charge of any congregation of this Church, or, in case of vacancy or absence, no churchwarden, vestryman or trustees of the congregation shall permit any person to officiate therein without sufficient evidence of his being duly licensed or ordained to minister in this Church; provided that nothing herein shall be so construed as to forbid communicants of the Church to act as lay-readers, or to prevent the minister in charge of any congregation of this Church, when authorized by his bishop, from permitting a sermon or address therein by any Christian person approved by the bishop."

When the matter was brought before the House of Deputies it was explained that there had been a clerical error in the wording of the amendment as approved by the bishops, and that the addition to Canon XIX should have read, "or to prevent the bishop of a diocese or missionary district from giving permission to Christian men not ministers of this Church to make addresses in the Church on special occasions."

The canon in this last form was adopted. In the clerical order there were 41 ayes, 19 noes, and 2 divided, in the lay order 38 ayes, 7 noes, and 5 divided.

Last May, several High Church clergymen in Philadelphia withdrew from their own Church, and sought admission to the Church of Rome, as a protest against this "innovation." Actually it was not an innovation. The practice had long been established and the amended canon merely confirmed the practice. The secessionists probably used the "innovation" as an excuse for what they had already determined to do. Their position in regard to "Apostolic succession" is more extreme than that of Archbishop Laud—famous defender of the Divine Right of Kings.

In this country, a belief in Apostolic succession, in its *literal* sense, requires a faith in the principles of democracy which the present writer

does not possess. For in America the Bishops are elected by the parishioners—not directly, but in much the same way that a President of the United States may be said to be elected “by the people.” And although this method is probably better than that which prevails in the Church of England, where the Bishops are appointed practically by the Prime Minister, who may be an Angostic or an Atheist; or than the method of the Church of Rome, which has produced Popes of such disrespectful notoriety—it seems that valuable time would be wasted if anyone were to attempt to prove that a Presbyterian minister, for instance, must necessarily be unfit to preach in an Episcopal pulpit because he lacks ordination at the hands of a Bishop in that particular Church.

The Preface, written in 1789, to the Book of Common Prayer “according to the use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America,” suggests a liberality in matters of Church discipline which recent secessionists have failed to assimilate. The opening paragraph states:

“It is a most invaluable part of that blessed liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, that in his worship different forms and usages may without offence be allowed, provided the substance of the Faith be kept entire; and that, in every Church, what cannot be clearly determined to belong to Doctrine must be referred to Discipline; and therefore, by common consent and authority, may be altered, abridged, enlarged, amended, or otherwise disposed of, as may seem most convenient for the edification of the people, ‘according to the various exigencies of times and occasions.’ ”

According to Bishop Doane of Albany, those who oppose the growing liberality of Episcopalianism must be classed as belonging to “The Narrow Church.” Concluding a vehement article in *The Churchman*, of May 16th, he says:

“These may seem strong and bitter words, but if prejudice and partisanship are to prevail, if the issue is to be forced by gross misunderstanding and misstatement of the meaning of recent legislation, if the Church is to be kept in turmoil and unrest by a few turbulent spirits, if she is to be made ludicrous by an attempt to tie her, under full sail, to anchorages of narrow isolation, then the fight is on; and timidity and time-serving must give way to the recognition of ‘the depth and length and breadth and height’ of the awakened love and life of our aroused and real catholicity.”

The truth is that, “provided the substance of the Faith be kept entire,” it would be in the interest of the Church to welcome any and all preachers whose message promises to be “for the edification of the people.” More and more clearly the Church needs to learn that “the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.” If the life of a man proves that he has “the spirit of Christ”; that he has “love, joy, peace,” and

understanding—then that man is no longer “under the law.” He should be welcome in every pulpit in the land. And in the interest of the Church and its mission; in the interest of its spiritual life and development, it is to be hoped that the action of the last Triennial Convention will at no time be reversed, but, on the contrary, that the Bishops and clergy will be allowed an ever wider freedom to recognize a spiritual as well as an ecclesiastical hierarchy, and to choose whomsoever they see fit, without distinction of race or creed or caste, to preach “the gospel of peace and glad tidings of good things.”

FROM A STUDENT'S NOTE-BOOK.

Schopenhauer was undoubtedly right in condemning the reading of novels. I have read them by the hundred for years, but have converted myself, for the third time, to the view that, with few exceptions, they are as injurious in their effect on character as whiskey or opium: for they accentuate the Illusion—which is just what we want to escape. On young people especially their influence is pernicious. Schopenhauer suggests that their place should be taken by suitable biographies, such as the life of Franklin. But in this respect I think he misses part of the point, for novels are harmful because they falsely impress us as real. Legends and myths, on the other hand, whether Christian, Scandinavian, Greek, Roman or Hindu, do not impress us as real, but as symbolical, as universal; and thus lead the mind from the visible to the invisible, from the material to the spiritual. For that reason I would combine them with the reading of biography and history.

Gautama Buddha perhaps had the same thing in mind when he prescribed for his novices, not only “abstinence from destroying life; abstinence from stealing; abstinence from lying; abstinence from strong drink and intoxicating liquors, which cause indifference (to religion),” but also “abstinence from dancing, singing, music and *seeing spectacles*” (“Vinaya Texts,” *Mahāvagga*, I, 56). Such abstinence, of course, if for “novices” only—we are exempt! But as he said on another occasion, when asked by his aunt Gotamī for his doctrine “in abstract”:

“Of whatsoever doctrines thou shalt be conscious, Gotamī, that they conduce to passion and not to peace, to pride and not to veneration, to wishing for much and not to wishing for little, to love of society and not to seclusion, to sloth and not to the exercise of zeal, to being hard to satisfy and not to content—verily mayest thou then, Gotamī, bear in mind that that is not . . . the teaching of the Master.” (*Kullavagga*, X, 5, 1).

UNREST IN BRITISH INDIA.

A very great love for India should excuse some frank suggestions. First, for its general bearing on the situation, there is a passage worth

remembering in Nietzsche's *Also Sprach Zarathustra*—a passage in which that brilliant writer stated a truth with less of personal prejudice than usually beclouded him:

"Art thou a new power and a new right? A wheel self-moving?

"Thou callest thyself free? I wish to hear the thought that commands thee—not that thou hast escaped a yoke.

"Art thou such as should escape a yoke? Many there are who threw away all that they were worth when they threw away their servitude.

"Free from what? What doth that concern Zarathustra! Clearly thine eye shall answer: free *for* what!"

The unrest in India is very closely allied with the social unrest in Europe and America. They are similar phases of the same tendency. In the West we are told that a reorganization of society would cure our ills and would either make us, or would help us to become (according to the bias of the speaker), moral and happy. In the East we are told much the same thing, the reorganization, in this case, involving a rejection of British control. In the West it is the "predatory rich"; in the East it is the "predatory British," who are held responsible for all our woes. Sometimes, in this country, it would seem as if the very Angel of Death ("our sweet Sister, the death of the body") should be portrayed as a multi-millionaire: for it is difficult to discover the ill for which the rich man is not held accountable, and death, in the view of these reformers, must surely be the greatest ill of all.

But this does not imply approval of existing conditions. No one can deny the need for reform, either here or in India. In more than one State in America the condition of the Courts of Justice, for instance (with apologies to Justice), is an unspeakable disgrace. The question is, however—What is the cause of the disease, and what will effect a cure?

In the East as in the West, certain palliatives are proposed which should evoke our hearty approval—although, from the fact that we may accept an Allopath's advice to take a hot bath and go to bed, it should not be inferred that we are prepared to swallow the whole of the allopathic pharmacopœia!

In India, a movement has been started known as Swardeshi. The avowed object of this is to encourage home industries. It has been commended by Lord Minto, the Governor-General. Theosophists everywhere will wish it success. But American sympathizers have sent to the native Indian press, letters which, in several respects, are greatly to be regretted. After reading these letters the present writer was tempted to address their authors to this effect:

"You will agree with me that if this movement is inspired by some 'anti' sentiment, it is foredoomed to failure and will deserve to fail. If, on the other hand, it is inspired by a 'pro' sentiment—by genuine love

of India without hatred or fear of anyone—then it will deserve and will meet with success.

"I know, from experience, how difficult it is to preserve that attitude, and am not surprised, therefore, that there has crept into your articles a strong suggestion of anti-ism. Here and there it strikes me that the motive you stimulate (doubtless unconsciously), is not pure love for India, but hatred of those you believe to be its enemies; and that you appeal to the people of India to rally to the Swardeshi standard primarily because it promises to confound their rulers. Any such motive as that would of course defeat the very end you have in view—the general and true and permanent prosperity of the Indian people.

"It seems to me also that in the heat of battle (and again I know what that is), you have made use of expressions which might mislead, and which tend to defeat your ends. To tell people to 'cultivate an attitude of conscious equality with all mankind' is to tell them to deny the facts of nature. They may be very superior in some respects and at the same time very inferior in others. What you must have meant was that they should strive to become, *to be*, the highest that is within them; that they should strive *to be* noble men—not that they should cultivate an attitude of conscious equality with noblemen. That would be the same mistake that some green emigrant makes when he first comes over here; when he merely abandons his manners and imagines that he has surrendered his claim to citizenship if by any chance he happens to have shown respect to someone who knows more or who is better mannered than himself.

"Also, when you ask the Hindus whether 'such shameful treatment' should not arouse their 'self-assertion,' I think the heat of battle again becomes evident. For I do not believe in going to the poor and telling them that they are being shamefully treated, and, by inference, that they ought to rebel against the 'predatory rich.' I do not believe in telling them to assert themselves against their masters or employers (in spite of the Socialist assertion that the wealth of the employers actually and historically belongs to the employed). On the contrary, I believe in telling them that the truly self-respecting man has no need to be self-assertive, and as a matter of fact is *not* self-assertive; I believe in telling them to look to themselves—to their habits of thought and conduct—rather than to the alleged 'shameful treatment' of others, for the true cause of their sufferings. I believe that it is the curse of the modern world to look upon what we have or have not, as the cause of what we *are*. I believe that self-respect and self-reliance based upon economic prosperity, implies a contradiction in terms—that such self-respect is not self-respect at all, but merely self-assertion, and therefore worse than valueless because self-deceptive and foredoomed to collapse. I believe, on the other hand, that economic prosperity will surely follow as a result

of true self-reliance and self-respect. In the one case you produce a temporary glamor; in the other a permanent reality.

"I feel sure you will agree with me so far, and that you will go even further with me practically. For suppose a self-assertiveness could be aroused in the Indian people (and I have too great a regard for the best in Indian character to believe that this could be done)—a self-assertiveness sufficiently demonstrative to make British rule impossible. Let us imagine, in other words, that the British were to withdraw: practically, what would happen? Did you notice the other day that 20,000 Afghans began a picnic-raid from the north? Did you notice that that raid was stopped by the British? What would happen if the British were not there? History, and even contemporary history, proves that 'eat 'em alive' would become an Afghan joke! Further than that, I suspect that even before the Afghans had started, there would develop among the Punjabis a desire to get there first; and that among the Sikhs there would develop a similar desire, and that there would be some picturesque but very terrible fighting in the streets of Calcutta, not between the Sikhs and the Bengalis, but perhaps between the Sikhs and the Burmans of the north. This, of course, is simply an inference from history: but that Afghan raid is a fact. And there are women whom it would not be right to forget.

"Imagine yourself to be a very wise Hindu, a great lover of your country, with foresight as well as knowledge of the past. Imagine that you have a large following, or could have if you wanted it. Imagine yourself to be a hundred years old or more. You would for years have seen those Afghans to the north. Behind them you would have seen the Russians. You would say to yourself, 'The British conquered India, because in India there was no true brotherhood, no true self-reliance, no true self-respect. We have been conquered and again conquered—wave after wave of conquest. It is best that we should have a long period of peace. Perhaps brotherhood and self-reliance and self-respect will come if we revive an interest and belief in the most ancient India of all—in the India of the Shastras, in the India of the Golden Age. And for this we must have peace; we must have time for reverent study, for reverent meditation. What would the Afghans do with our gods and with our literature! Would *they* respect the past!'

"You would look at India as it is to-day and you would see that your people have not yet learned either brotherhood or self-respect. You would see Hindus drawing pay from the British government, some of them in positions of high honor, and yet secretly plotting against the hand which they allow to feed them—the hand which, with all its faults, makes them and their children safe. And you would see worse than this, for you would find that some of these same Hindus are *not* plotting: there is not a scrap of evidence against them: they are merely allowing others to

plot—by gentle shrugs, by blank looks, by indirect suggestion, they are encouraging others to plot. And they draw British pay. You would know that such loss of self-respect, or such lack of it—so complete that they are not even conscious of the sin against themselves—is proof that the revival on which you based your hopes has scarcely yet begun.

"You would not lose faith in your people or in your cause: you would work more devotedly than ever for true brotherhood and true self-reliance, and for the revival of the great spirit of the past. But you would emphatically discourage any and all efforts the effect of which is to divert attention and energy from the real issue and from the only lasting cure. Still more emphatically would you discourage such efforts if they threatened to defeat, either by cataclysm or by slow degeneration, the very hope for which you are working.

"So, while you would encourage Swardeshi in so far as that is based on creative love of country and of man, and in so far as it promises to revive what is best in Indian life and character and literature and art and commerce, you would, on the other hand, utterly deplore it if it were to be inspired by self-destructive hate. By your life and by your teaching you would remind your countrymen that there is only one way in which a tree or a nation can make sound growth—that is, from the root up; and that the root of every nation is the heart of its average man."

X.

In the lower worlds we rejoice because of SOMETHING—some possession or event. But in the spiritual world we rejoice in the fullness and splendour of BEING—because of what IS—and as we increase our share in that Consciousness, deep and deeper grows our Joy. We enter into the Song of Life; we BECOME that Song. BOOK OF ITEMS.



ELEMENTARY ARTICLES

III.

THEOSOPHY AND THE FAMILY.

DEAR FRIEND: I think you will agree with me when I say that the family is the most important of all our institutions. It is more important than the State, and more sacred than the Church. The family is the foundation of society, government and laws. If the family be industrious, economical, studious, moral and refined, so is the society of which it is a member. But if discord, ignorance, and selfishness rule in the family circle, society at large will feel these contaminating influences. If the family be destroyed, the State will be ruined; if infidelity and immorality corrupt the home, the springs are poisoned, and no ritual or religious worship can make the river pure.

It is worth while to put forth efforts to elevate, improve and perfect the family, for by so doing we may make it a fountain of joy and happiness, and save it from becoming a source of great misery and unhappiness. In doing this we are not only helping the individual and one little group, but sending out influences that will purify, improve and elevate society, so helping forward the evolution of the race. Can Theosophy do anything towards this? Can it throw any light on the great problems of the home, of marriage and divorce that are so greatly troubling the Church and social reformers to-day.

I do not know of any philosophy that can contribute so much to the solving of these dark problems as Theosophy can. Take the doctrines of Karma and Reincarnation and ask what they have to say about the conditions of family life in this twentieth century in Europe and America. Now I am far from agreeing with what I think are exaggerated pessimistic statements about family life that are so often made by our social reformers.

It may be true that there are not a great many ideal homes, or ideal marriages, for there are not a great many ideal men and women. Are there any other human institutions that are more successful than marriage and home-making are to-day?

"But did you ever know an age or a country that was so much cursed by divorce as the United States?" asks one. "Does it not show

that we are rapidly degenerating?" On the other hand, is it not fair to ask whether there was ever an age or a country in which woman was so free, or so highly respected as she is here? May we not also ask if anyone believes that the average level of civilization, or morality is higher in Spain, or Italy (for instance), where the Church is supreme and forbids the sundering of the marriage tie for any reason?

I am not excusing or defending present conditions, but pleading for a reasonable and charitable view of the situation, for the great central law of Theosophy demands this—the law of love and Brotherhood. If the family be sick it will be well to correctly diagnose the case before we apply remedies.

Does Theosophy throw any light on the causes that have produced present conditions? Let us see. Great teachers have told us that in other lives we have formed Karmic links with people which draw us together in this life as relatives, friends and enemies, some who help us and some who hinder us. Some without any reason so far as the present life is concerned love us deeply, and some there are who hate us, although we have done nothing to deserve such hatred during our present life. What we call family troubles may be the result of wrong thoughts and wrong actions in a previous incarnation.

A good father has a bad son, and a bad father has a good son; parents who dearly love and sacrifice for their children are bereaved of them. Others who take no pains to keep their children—nay, would even be glad to lose them—still keep them. A good wife gets a bad husband; a good husband gets an unfaithful wife. How is this? It is not entirely the fault of the present life, but of previous ones, and we are reaping what we sowed. That we are born in a certain race, nation, family, is not an accident. The law of Cycles has also its part in this.

These three laws—Karma, Reincarnation and Cycles—are so intermixed that we have to study them all in order to form a correct judgment.

Individuals are connected by invisible bonds to form nations and races, and although they seem to separate they really do not get apart. They disappear, but they emerge again together in a new race, or nation as the cycles roll round. The individuals who formed the most ancient civilizations come back again and again, and bring with them the idea and essence of the old civilization, and under the new conditions produce a civilization of a higher character. The great characters of these old civilizations reappear as leaders in a new life. W. Q. Judge says (*Ocean of Theosophy*), that "Charlemagne reincarnated as Napoleon Bonaparte, Clovis of France, was reborn as Emperor Frederick of Germany, and Washington, the first President of the United States of America, where the root for the new race is being formed." He also says that race and national cycles are both historical, which means that

the old Greeks and Romans will come back in masses that can be to a very large extent plainly traced. It has also been said that crowds of Romans are now being reborn as Englishmen and Americans. Those of the old Romans who were drawn together by family ties and strong affections will probably be drawn together again as members of the same family. We are told that quite often the destinies of two individuals are woven together through many lives, but sometimes they are separated for one or two lives because the Devachanic period of one is longer than the other on account of the difference in mental and spiritual activity—but they will ultimately meet again.

The Karma of an individual is linked with that of his family, and while it may generally be true that he gets what he deserves, yet he may sometimes get what he has not earned so far as his individual Karma goes, but for this he will always be compensated. When the disciples asked Jesus whether the man or his parents had sinned that he should be born blind, he replied that in this case neither had sinned but there was a purpose in it (Jno. 9: 1-3). Now if these Roman families are now being reborn it would be interesting to know something about the characters and habits in the last incarnation. Mr. Lecky in his *History of European Morals* has something to say about the family life of the Romans that may not only interest us but may also throw some light on present social conditions if we accept the testimony of Theosophy as expressed in the doctrines of Karma, Incarnation and Cycles. He says: "With the exception of her dowry, which passed into the hands of her husband, the wife held her property in her own right; she inherited her share of the wealth of her father, and she retained it altogether independent of her husband. A very considerable proportion of Roman wealth passed into the uncontrolled possession of women. The private man of business of the wife was a favorite character with the comedians, and the tyranny exercised by rich wives over their husbands—to whom it is said they sometimes lent money at high interest—was a constant theme of satirists. A complete revolution has thus passed over the family. Instead of being constructed on the principle of autocracy, it was constructed on the principle of co-equal partnership. The legal position of the wife had become one of complete independence, while her social position was one of great dignity.

Being looked upon as a civil contract entered into for the happiness of the contracting parties, the continuance of marriage depended upon mutual consent. Either party might dissolve it at will, and the dissolution gave both parties the right to remarry. There can be no doubt that under this system the obligations of marriage were treated with extreme levity. We find Cicero repudiating his wife, Terentia, because he wanted a new dowry; Maecenas continually changing his wife; Sempronius Sophus repudiating his wife because she had once

been to the public games without his knowledge; Paulus Emilius taking the same step without assigning the reason, and defending himself by saying, 'My shoes are new and well made, but no one knows where they pinch me.' Nor did women show less alacrity in repudiating their husbands. Seneca denounced this evil with special vehemence, declaring that divorce in Rome no longer brought with it any shame, and that there were women who reckoned their years rather by their husbands than by consuls. Martial speaks of a woman who had already arrived at her tenth husband; Juvenal of a woman having eight husbands in five years. But the most extraordinary recorded instance of this kind is related by St. Jerome who assures us that there existed in Rome a wife who was married to her twenty-third husband, she being his twenty-first wife."

Perhaps this is a glimpse of our own past, if so what can we do? We can remember that we have made our own Karma, that the thoughts, desires and actions of the past have created our present character, faculties and environment. And further we may remember that the living soul is still king and can strengthen or weaken these capacities, and enlarge or contract these limitations. We have forged the chains that bind us and we can break them; we have built the prison in which we find ourselves and we can pull it down. However much we are hampered to-day by the limitations we made yesterday, we are still master of our to-morrows. It is written in one of the Upanishads, "Man is a creature of reflection: that which he reflects on in this life he becomes the same hereafter." Sir Edwin Arnold has translated a proverb from the *Hitopadesha* as follows:

"Look! the clay dries into iron, but the potter moulds the clay;
Destiny to-day is master—man was master yesterday."

But as already stated he may be master again to-morrow. But for the present life, can anything be done? Suppose the conditions of the home have become intolerable, can anything be done? As a result of past living the home is one of misery, husband and wife are antagonistic and neither believes that they can do anything to change the atmosphere and win back freedom and happiness, but each one thinks the other one is wholly to blame. How can our philosophy help here?

First let us not forget that the position in which we find ourselves is not only the result of our past, but it is also a moral test in the present, and that our future will depend on how we meet this trial. We had better not run away from our troubles for they will meet us again if we do. It is better to face them and bear them patiently and cheerfully, as we ourselves have made them and are solely to blame.

The first thing to do is to cast out all selfishness, face the conditions

and talk the matter over with each other, frankly and calmly. Remember too, that if there are children in the home we have duties to them, and we have no right to sacrifice their welfare and training just to save ourselves from trouble, or to gratify our own whims or passions. If both can take the Theosophical view of the matter and live the life all will be well, for met in this spirit, our trouble will become a purifier and regenerator, although it may not be possible suddenly to restore the home to an ideal state.

If only one of the parties be willing to take this view, the case will be more difficult to settle, but let not that one despair, for "Love conquers all things."

Let us further remember that thoughts are the bands that have bound us, and that in proportion as our thoughts are pure, true, beautiful and loving we become free. A study of Karma and the application of the great law of love to the home life will prove to be a cure for all our troubles.

So far I have said nothing about the children for whom the home is prepared, and I have little to say on that subject here, but will refer you to the article on page 135 of the THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY of October, 1906.

Is it not true that the children are as great a blessing to the parents as the parents are to the children? They keep us young, they deepen the love of father and mother for each other, they are the poetry, sweetness, beauty, cheer and delight of the home. If this be so, we owe to them the very best we can give in the way of care, training and love. If we feel this obligation and try to meet it we shall find that selfishness and self-indulgence that stand in the way will be eliminated and that in seeking to unfold their powers we have really been expanding and enlarging ourselves. As we seek to develop reverence, tenderness and helpfulness in the children, we are enriching our own future and helping to purify and ennoble society.

Blessed are we if we have a part as parents or children in the making of an ideal home where purity, health, reverence, refinement, tenderness and helpfulness are supreme, for in this atmosphere of the finest and best things, the best that is in us will surely be unfolded, and through such a home, society will be greatly blessed. Theosophy lived, and daily put into practice will give us the ideal home.

Fraternally yours,

JOHN SCHOFIELD.



REVIEWS

The Church and Modern Men, by William Scott Palmer, published by Longmans, Green and Co., 1907. The purpose of the author, a devout Churchman, is evidently two-fold: first, to educate the clergy of the Church of England, and secondly to suggest to those laymen who have left the Church or who are inclined to leave it, that by "a recognition of the symbolic character of dogma," they can co-operate conscientiously even with those who adhere to the older and narrower method of interpretation. His attitude is splendidly liberal and tolerant. He quotes with approval the saying of Justin Martyr that men who "lived under the guidance of the Eternal Reason, such as Socrates and Heraclitus," were Christians. He argues that "If a man has believed that Zeus gave strength to his arm, we do better to acknowledge the strengthening of the arm than to attack his belief in Zeus as untrue. He will be our own present man, a brother, if we see Zeus as his appropriate symbol and accept as real the fact that came into his life."

But immediately following this last quotation there is a passage which, while emphasizing his liberality of view, also lays bare the dreadful poverty to which such apologists are at present reduced. For, he continues, as an inference from the illustration of the believer in Zeus—"And when the Christian Fathers of us all agreed in declaring that Christ 'descended into hell,' can we refuse to see that, although it did not seem to them a symbol at all, they had no more fitting symbol to express the truth of the greatness and depth of penetration by which the divine Lord of life, in perfect love, takes earthly humanity, past and present, unto Himself, and does not shrink from contact from the worst and lowest things of human fate? Could we say this better ourselves? For them, hell was a place under their feet—what of that? The error was of the passing stage of their intellect, the truth was vital and essential and eternal, ours, theirs, every man's, inexhaustible and indestructible." All of which, as an interpretation, is of course true—generally and vaguely true. But what a responsibility rests upon us to point out the deeper and more explicit significance of this and other Christian symbols! How long will it be before we, as students of the esoteric philosophy, come to the rescue of these men who are so valiantly, but with such inadequate weapons, defending the spirit against the dead letter of the Christian tradition? That the life of Christ epitomizes and represents the life of every human soul, and the pre-natal evolution of the spiritual body, as clearly and realistically as the life of the embryo epitomizes and represents the evolution of the animal body—this idea, once the tremendous actuality of the soul is recognized, is destined, we hope, to raise such dogmas as the "descent into hell," from the plane of theological exegesis, first to that of psychology, and ultimately to that of religious contemplation and inner experience.

X.

MAGAZINE LITERATURE.

The Hibbert Journal for April. As usual the reviewer stands appalled at the task of giving an adequate notice of this great journal. A mere descriptive enu-

meration of its contents would fill our space. The opening article is perhaps the most important; for it raises the question of the validity of personal illumination, of conscious communion with Christ. It also discusses the difference between a personal communication with Christ and the Virgin or one of the saints. The writer, the Rev. P. T. Forsyth, tries to prove that it is a difference in *esse* and not in degree, and fails, for the reason that he does not know what he is talking about. It is pathetic to see a learned, devout, and splendidly religious man floundering in the mazes of speculative mysticism, and unable to get anywhere, or say anything, from lack of a knowledge of some of the simpler laws of the spiritual life, which many Eastern books, and almost any text book on Theosophy would adequately explain to him.

Mr. G. Lowes Dickinson writes on "Knowledge and Faith." He thinks no "intelligent and candid modern man" can be a Christian because a Christian must believe that Jesus was "a divine being, in a sense in which no other man has been or can be divine," and then he proceeds to show what a modern intelligent man can believe. No, not *believe*, for, to quote his exact words: "One believes what one knows; and in the region of which I am speaking one does not know. What I am driving at is rather a tentative apprehension, not caring much about the intellectual forms in which it finds expression, but caring very much about the substance with which it imagines it comes into contact." It seems to us very thin, as a working faith, and we disagree with his definition of a Christian.

The next article is about Goethe. There is much written about Goethe now-a-days. Let us hope that those who concern themselves with this great poet will pay special heed to the fact that Goethe was an avowed believer in reincarnation, for without reincarnation much speculative theology and considerable philosophy is useless mental gymnastics.

Canon Vaughan has a delightfully witty article on "What is the Catholic Church?" His "zoological garden theory" is delicious. Sir Oliver Lodge continues to write of "The Immortality of the Soul." "An Agnostic's Consolation" is again hopeless reading, because of the absence of belief in reincarnation. Paul E. Mose, literary editor of *The Nation*, has an interesting article on Manichæism, which he calls "The Dualism of Saint Augustine." G.

International Journal of Ethics, for April, has an article on "The Ethics of Nietzsche," by A. C. Pigou, while "The Struggle for Existence in Relation to Morals and Religion," by Mabel Atkinson, deals principally with the same subject. Both these writers appear to base their opinion of Nietzsche solely upon "Thus Spake Zarathustra" and "Beyond Good and Evil." Both make the radical mistake of trying to systematize him. He himself would have scorned the idea of having uttered more than a series of impressions. For him the man was everything; the philosophy very little. "Das Leben Friedrich Nietzsches," by his sister, Elizabeth Förster-Nietzsche, is essential to an understanding of his method. In the second volume (Leipzig, 1904; pp. 426, 427) some recollections of his life are quoted, which he wrote during the fall of 1888. He speaks as follows of the way in which many of his works, and particularly his "Zarathustra," had been produced: "Has any one, at the end of the nineteenth century, a clear conception of what poets of the strong age called Inspiration. If not, I will describe it. With the very least remains of superstition in him, anyone would, in fact, hardly know how to throw aside the idea of being merely the incarnation, merely the mouth-piece, merely the medium of some superior power. It is the idea of revelation, in the sense that suddenly, with inexpressible certainty and distinction ["distinction" rather in the sense of nobility], something becomes visible and audible; something

most deeply moves and disturbs one. That describes simply a matter of fact. One hears—one does not seek; one takes—one does not ask who gives. Like lightning a thought flashes forth, of necessity, in fixed form and without a shadow of turning: I have never had any choice. An ecstasy, of which the tremendous tension sometimes dissolves in a flood of tears, and during which one's steps involuntarily become now precipitant, now slow; a complete externalization of oneself [*auszersichsein*, "beyond oneself"], with the most distinct consciousness of innumerable light [*feiner*] shudders and purlings [*überrieselungen*] right down to the toes; a depth of happiness, in which the utmost pain and gloom do not appear as a contrast, but as though consequent, as provoked, as a necessary color within such an abundance of light; a flash [literally, an instinct] of rhythmical proportion spanning vast stretches of forms. . . . All this happens with absolute involuntariness, but as though in a tempest of feeling—the feeling of freedom, of utterness, of power, of divinity. The involuntariness of picture and of comparison is the most remarkable thing about it. One no longer has any notion what picture or comparison is. Everything presents itself as the nearest, the most precise, the most simple Expression. . . . That is my experience of inspiration. I doubt not that one would have to go back a thousand years to find anyone who would dare to say to me: 'It is also mine.'" Students of Theosophy will understand, from much in the foregoing statement, why it is that in Nietzsche's writings a paragraph of truth and beauty will often be followed by another of almost diabolical perversity. He was mediumistic; and the colossal vanity of the man, so amazingly revealed in the closing words of the quotation, made the mediumism worse confounded. To systematize him is impossible. X.

The Annals of Psychical Science for March contains matter of great interest, so much so that the April and May issues are quite eclipsed. The opening article by Henry A. Fotherby, D.P.H., Camb., on "Sound and Music in Their Physical and Psychological Relationship to Form, Light and Color," is a valuable and careful study, which the title sufficiently explains. Incidentally, Van der Weyde is quoted as being said to have "demonstrated" in his lectures "that the vibrations of the first, third, and fifth notes of the diatonic scale bear the same relation to one another as the colors red, yellow, and blue." But the article of supreme interest is that by Frederic H. Balfour, entitled, "The Patagonian Mage." It is a record of seances held in Florence in 1906, at which, for the most part, the "controls" declared themselves to be living and embodied men—one of them a Mage, a native of Patagonia; another, a disciple of the latter, whose home he described as being among the icebergs near Hudson's Bay in North America. They always talked in Latin. On one occasion the disciple arrived without the Mage, and explained that his "magister" had been detained owing to terrific storms prevailing near Lake Baikal in Siberia, where he was visiting; and when asked how it could be that wind could interfere with aetheric or astral voyaging, the disciple replied that movements of the air often correspond with movements of the "magnetic wind." Much was said about the laws governing the connection of the astral with the physical body. Both Mage and disciple claimed to be practitioners of magic. On one occasion the Mage "told us that for every malady there was an antidote among plants. Each plant, he said, contained the necessary ingredients in the exact proportions required, so that it was a mistake to separate them as doctors do." A *resumé* of some remarks by the Mage, on another occasion, is given as follows: "Every man leads two distinct lives; one by day, while awake, the other by night, while asleep. He is thus made up of two different personalities, each of which is profoundly unconscious of the other. The night life is just as

real and as continuous as the day life, but only a very highly developed person can remember it during his waking hours. In dreams, however, it is the day-personality which is, so far, conscious. [At this point Mr. Balfour refers the reader to E. J. W. Gibb's *History of Ottoman Poetry*, vol I, p. 57, text and note.] These two sets or lines of experience produce an effect upon the Ego, or Real Self, of the individual, though the Ego is not conscious of it at the time (?) . . . God is within you, and you are in God." All of which shows, in any case, that the minds of modern sitters are very much more theosophically inclined than were those of spiritualists a quarter of a century ago. In fact, the whole tendency of current psychical research is surprisingly theosophical—not in method, unfortunately, but in dogmatic result. X.

The New Theology Magazine for April, May, and June wishes well to everything in sight. It includes us in its universal benediction. Its editor states that on a recent Sunday he went to mass in the morning; to a Christian Science service in the afternoon ("and the earth I stood on swayed back and forth and almost disappeared out of sight as I reached back to the Greek mysteries of the past"); and to a Spiritualistic seance in the evening, and enjoyed them all equally. We are glad to be included in such catholicity, and trust that our pages may help to steady the earth for our well-wisher, whose message in many respects is preferable to much that passes as "New Thought." X.

The Open Court for April has several articles of interest. "Problems of Modern Theology," by the editor, is useful; and "God and the World Physical," by Professor Lawrence H. Mills, of Oxford, is instructive as showing the quandary in which a theologian is placed who, while accepting the theory of evolution, tries to reconcile this with an act of creation in time as symbolically described in the first chapter of Genesis. Study of Eastern Philosophy would help to remove their difficulty, for the old Indian teaching of cyclic progress between the alternating periods of *manvantara*, or manifestation, and *pralaya*, or latency, supplies the missing link. And in this connection it is well to remember that the same idea was formulated scientifically by Herbert Spencer in his *First Principles*, in Chapter X on "The Rhythm of Motion," in Chapter XXIII on "Dissolution," and in the "Summary and Conclusion" (Chapter XXIV). As he says, and proves: "There is an alternation of Evolution and Dissolution in the totality of things." A proposed substitute for the Lord's Prayer of Christianity is quite illuminating. It is suggested by Mr. T. B. Wakeman, introduced by the editor as "a well-known agitator of liberalism and a leader in the ranks of humanitarian (?) reform." Mr. Wakeman says: "If it is anything at all, it is really the most important thing put in print for a *very* long time." This is typical of a psychic revelation—and it may be one. The first two lines are: "O World, O Man, and Soul of Me—The Endless All, Our *Three* in One!" The first lines of another verse are: "So bring our Republic of Man, Our *Paradise of Earth* to be." The italics are not ours—neither is the metre! But then comes the explanation of the "Me" in the first line. We are told: "The *I* or *Me* is our subjective consciousness of 'Ego,' which the objective World, Man, and Soul—the unconscious or sub-liminal action of our nerve-system—constantly beget, create, and sustain; or which attends that objective *Three* as a concomitant correlation.'" To which we need only add, May the kind Fates preserve us from that Paradise, for on this occasion we would rather live—in Kansas. The May number reminds us of a little-known mystic, whose adopted name was Angelus Silesius, and who lived from 1624 to 1677. He was born a Protestant but became a Catholic, and joined

the Order of St. Francis. He was a physician and a scientist, becoming Court Physician to the Emperor, but was also a poet. His "Cherubineau Wanderer" is the best known of his works, extracts from which are given by Dr. Carus. One verse reads: "God Father is a point, God Son the circuit line, And God the Ghost does both as area combine."

The Monist for April contains a useful article by F. H. Gile on "Some Dangerous Tendencies of Modern Materialistic Psychology." The writer does not say so, but the fact is that a materialistic psychology is responsible for the growth of many modern movements which, superficially, have no connection whatever with the subject of psychology. It is clear that for anyone who regards himself as only "an empirical aggregate of things objectively known," the influence of environment must appear as the *only* factor in the evolution of character. Another article of interest is by D. Teitaro Suzuki, entitled, "A Brief History of Chinese Philosophy." The writer does not do justice to Taoism, and utterly misinterprets the meaning of *Wu Wei* ("It means not to interfere with others' affairs" !); but to expect an understanding of that, by a non-Taoist, unless he has studied the *Bhagavad Gita*, and knows the meaning of "inaction," would be to expect too much.

The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods. The four numbers from April 9th to May 21st maintain the high standard for which this *Journal* has become famous. Lack of space in this issue makes lengthy comment impossible; but we may mention the especial value of the "Reviews and Abstracts of Literature," which, in these days of condensed reading, supply a pressing need. The discussion by Professor W. P. Montague and Professor Bode of "Consciousness and Relativity" is really instructive.

Theosophisches Leben for March, April, and May, provides many well-selected translations, in addition to some valuable original matter. This little magazine does our friends in Germany the greatest possible credit. Its publication has been continued successfully in face of difficulties which would have discouraged all but the most persevering, until now, if we may judge by appearance and contents, it is so firmly established that it will last as long as the movement lasts in Germany—we hope forever!

Sonnen Strahlen, edited by Mrs. Corvinus, is designed especially for children; but there is much in it that will be helpful also to older students, and in any case to all who associate with children and who wish to instruct without wearying them.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

QUESTION 84.—*How are we to know that we are on the right Path?*

ANSWER.—We have the privilege of guessing. Further, we may hope. And to hope sincerely points to a probability. Interior conviction is not a sufficient test, because when people are furthest off the Path they are usually the most sure that they are walking a chalked line down its center. But of certain things there can be no doubt: if we are full of passion and not of peace, of pride and not of veneration, of love of society and not of solitude, of sloth and not of energy and zeal, of discontent and not of contentment, and if we find ourselves wishing to *have* and not to *be*—then, as Buddha said, we may know that we are on the wrong Path.

X.

ANSWER.—We may know that we are on the right Path when we have real peace within ourself; that stillness or mental rest which comes from the sense or feeling of doing our duty. There is no peace or rest comparing to it; and it is only to the degree that we do our duties that we can obtain that peace or rest.

J. P. N.

QUESTION 85.—*Is anything impossible, and what constitutes the limitation if there be such?*

ANSWER.—Nothing is impossible except a contradiction in terms. That was a dictum of Professor Huxley, and it seems to cover the ground. "Black is white" is a contradiction in terms, and therefore impossible. But things are not impossible merely because they contradict general experience.

X.

ANSWER.—On the selfish and separated unit, thinking its real self to be the body and its attributes, the bonds of time and space press heavily in every direction. These bonds make many things impossible to the unit from his individual standpoint, but being due merely to a false conception of his own powers and possibilities, these impossibilities continually tend to disappear as the mind expands. Thus the actualities of to-day were the impossibilities of yesterday and our human impossibilities of to-day will be the actualities of to-morrow. Impossibility is merely a word which implies the sphere beyond the circle of present attainment. In the world of the absolute there are neither possibilities nor impossibilities, for everything "is" and yet separated existence is not.

K.

ANSWER.—Yes, many things are impossible. Aside from want of conditions which make many things impossible, such as insufficient moisture in the earth and seeds to make them sprout and grow, or too much light to see the stars when the sun is shining brightly, we are limited by want of the requisite cause to produce the effect or result we desire, or, given the proper cause, we may lack time or

space, or both, to bring about the result. May we not say that the limitations are always due to want of causality, time and space, and that with a sufficient cause, and sufficient time and space, that all things *may be* possible? We cannot move in opposite directions at the same time for perhaps want of sufficient cause. We cannot travel at the present time around this earth on dry land. It may be possible some day. We cannot find a walnut shell large enough to contain this world; here space is the limitation. It takes time for atoms to become men, and men to become gods. We cannot gain the knowledge of earth-life except by incarnating in physical bodies. We cannot produce causes without reaping their effects. We cannot be fully conscious on two planes at the same time. It is impossible to become a Mahâtma before one has become an Adept.

Consciousness is not possible without Mind, for consciousness is a faculty of the Mind. Not only are finite beings limited by time and space, but the All-Being would be limited by these. The Absolute All or Boundless Being must have Boundless Space and Boundless Age or Duration. The Supreme Being cannot reach the perfection gained only by the end of a manvantara, in one of our days of twenty-four hours. When we say, as is said in the *Bible* or in *Light on the Path*, that "With faith all things are possible," we mean all things are possible with faith when faith is based upon right knowledge of the Truth or the Law, not when based upon ignorance or fancy. M. W. D.

ANSWER.—We are bound to this earthly frame as the result of two laws, Cyclic and Karmic Laws. Without Substance we could not have Spirit, without Spirit we could not have Substance. They are both a necessity. The Spirit or rather Divine Causation, needing a vehicle, periodically manifests according to Cyclic Law and develops a divine being. During this process of development, we are hindered by the limitations of matter in which it manifests. Until we have reached a stage of enlightenment where we can think and reason whatever we wish and desire to undertake, we will be hindered, just as the walls of the temple hinder us from looking through them.

We in our incarnations build around us a wall of much finer density than that of our bodies as the result of desires and passions. These desires and passions hinder us so far as they pertain to the personal self and must have time for their development. This process of development is according to Karmic Law. When man has reached that stage of development when he no longer desires things earthly but divine, when he no longer thinks evil but pure thoughts, when the portals of the temple have been opened through which he can see and know the light that shines in his heart, when he hears and understands that still small voice within his own breast, when he does things for the good there is in them, when he loves mankind as a whole, and when he understands the law underlying each and every act and thought, then, and not till then are all things possible. M. D. H.

QUESTION 86.—*How far is one justified in tolerating what one believes to be evil?*

ANSWER.—The questioner lacks lucidity! To tolerate evil may mean to put up with the imperfections of our friends—something we are compelled to do if we would not become friendless. It may also mean—Mr. Editor, if this is your question—answer it! X.

ANSWER.—The first difficulty is with our beliefs; and a great deal of toleration for others' beliefs is needed.

If we are fully persuaded of the evil, the command to return good for evil will bring a great deal of toleration of the evil, *but no support*. An open fight is seldom beneficial; the energy thus expended will accomplish much more if used to instill good. As a light dispels darkness, so good replaces evil; our duty therefore lies in supporting, instilling and developing good in that place where we believe the evil to be and as a result the good will kill out the evil. By this means the evil has been tolerated only until the life forces, aiding that evil, could be drawn from the evil toward the good.

E. G. F.

ANSWER.—Up to the point where further tolerance would be participation in the evil doing.

This point is different for each one and is determined by the fact that most persons have been guilty of such evil acts and conduct, which hang on them like a handicap, that they cannot, justly and consistently, offer any vigorous resistance to an evil long after it has been recognized as such.

Others, of course, and they in the minority, are free from this obstacle; they recognize "evil" long before the majority are in the least aware of its presence and are enabled to direct their efforts immediately so as to mitigate its effects.

In short, the futility of one's attempts to combat evil is likely, in many cases, to be the only thing that will bring one to a proper and acute realization of the true state of affairs within oneself.

H. R.

ANSWER.—Under no circumstances am I justified in tolerating what I think evil in myself, though I may be forced to tolerate it, seeing human frailty in general. But excuse is not justification. As to tolerating what I think evil in others—what else can I do? That is, if toleration is meant by the question as endurance, not lenience or even merely forbearance.

V. J.

QUESTION 87.—*Could a really evil thought affect a pure mind?*

ANSWER.—In the terms of the question the answer must be in the negative. A pure mind could give no entrance to a really evil thought: there is no point of contact. But the matter really depends on where the consciousness is centered. Manas for the purposes of life, as we know it, is dual. If the consciousness is preserved in the higher Manas no really evil thought is possible. But if the level of consciousness descends into what is called Kama Manas, where it is surrounded by the vibrations of the personality, it becomes possible for so-called "evil" to contact it. Each moment becomes then a moment of choice and man must then ally himself with the aspirations which belong to his higher life or Manasic consciousness or with the Kama-Manasic desires of the personal life, which is the instrument he uses for everyday life. "Evil" in itself is a relative term. What is evil for one man may be for another comparatively good. Each man must decide for himself at a given moment what is "evil" in relation to his own duty and responsibilities as regards his highest conceptions. But he is in no position to judge the duty and responsibilities of another. All one can say is that a pure mind acting purely may find obstacles thrown in the way of its own action by the "really evil" thoughts of another mind. The mind pure in itself cannot be affected save in the way of opposition to its action.

ANSWER.—No; not if the mind be absolutely pure. But whose mind is, among such as we are?

A.

QUESTION 88.—*Is it always wrong to hate?*

ANSWER.—Invariably; and therefore it is always foolish, too. Hate is a force that binds us with bonds of steel to the person or thing or concept at which that force is directed. X.

ANSWER.—It is always wrong to hate, for hate is the opposite of love, and is the disintegrating force. It is the cause of man warring against man. Hate engenders coldness which kills all feeling of benevolence and kindness. Hate is a mental state that should at all times be avoided, it is one of the worst forms of selfishness; it sometimes manifests as fear, envy, or jealousy, and is always to be found in the man of impure mind, whose thoughts are defiled. It is man's deadliest enemy, for hate attracts hate and a person full of hate is incapable of love; such a one is to be pitied and must be regarded with love. Let the love within our hearts become active and attract the love in the heart of our brother. The only cure for hate is love, love for God and Humanity.

Love is the force that binds all men into one common Brotherhood.

A. A. O.

ANSWER.—Not necessarily. Hate is the opposite of Love. Hate is extreme dislike, and may be of the good or of the bad or evil. If of the evil or bad it is right. If of the good it is wrong. "When coupled with the desire that evil may befall" others, it is wrong, "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer" (I John, 3:15). "Hate the evil and love the good" (Amos, 5:15).

C. W. N.

ANSWER.—Yes: Hatred is the result of either fear, prejudice or envy, all of which are aspects of, or result from, selfishness. It is a perversion, through one of the above faults, of a natural divine energy which proceeds from the Logos and works out on the material plane.

This spiritual force is intended to accomplish the purposes of evolution, according to the Universal Intelligence, but we, through our ignorance, have identified this power and force with our own inclinations and, forgetting or not knowing what it is for, are permitting it to enliven motives of ambition, prejudice, envy and *hatred*, which is always wrong.

H. R.

ANSWER.—It depends on what meaning one attaches to the word hate and the word wrong. One's attitude should always be to help, which of course requires qualification. When one departs from the plane of equal mindedness and focalizes within himself currents of turbulence and friction, an injury to the nervous system is produced, resulting in nervous prostration when continued and pronounced. Hate attended with anger and a desire for revenge not only injures the subject, but starts currents in the ether of space which are communicated to other skull cavities filled with the universal ether, and produces corresponding vibrations in all brains attuned to the same dominant chord, as one wireless telegraphic instrument receives the message sent by another attuned to it.

The first thing to seek at all times during the wakeful state of consciousness is equanimity, and any Kamic disturbance, whether hate, anger, fear, worry, grief or depressing emotions should be controlled by the will power, as all these are disqualifying, malevolent and preventive of good results. If one is ruled by passion and hate, instead of understanding, reason and love, the action is on the Kamic plane, and progress on the higher planes is at a standstill. Love is the binding force of the Kosmos and hate the opposite. Love produces harmony, hate discord. Love purifies, is accompanied with joy and illuminates; hate contaminates, produces misery and ends in darkness.

W. A. R. T.

T·S·ACTIVITIES

THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY IN AMERICA.

The annual Convention of the Theosophical Society in America was held on April 25, 1908, at Dayton, Ohio, in pursuance of the call of the Executive Committee.

ADDRESS OF WELCOME.

The Chairman of the Executive Committee, Mr. Charles Johnston, called the Convention to order at 11 a. m., and welcomed the delegates, saying:

"As under the Constitution the Convention is summoned by the Executive Committee, it is my privilege, on behalf of the Executive Committee, to call the Convention to order. This I do with heartfelt pleasure, because I am convinced that the present Convention will be one of the most harmonious and successful in our annals, and will mark an epoch in our eventful history, the importance of which it is impossible to exaggerate. At intervals in our life as a Society, we have had periods of climax and crisis, and it is just ten years since the last such period of trial and transformation. The fact that we safely surmounted that trial, and that we have completed ten years since that period of transformation is in itself sufficient to give this Convention a special significance. That significance is increased by the fact that we now face the future with omens wholly favorable, with high grounds for hope and confidence, and with a period of unusual activity to record in the year just past. We have had a large increase of membership in the United States, in England, and especially in Germany. At the last Convention the hope was expressed that the members of "The Theosophical Society in Germany" would, as a body, accept the suggestion made by some of their members, for a closer union with their brothers in America. At the present Convention we have to make known the glad tidings that this union has been completed, and that, in bringing it about, the action of our German brothers has been cordial, generous and enthusiastic. We are certain that this action will evoke a response on our part as generous and cordial.

"At such a Convention as this, when we have to discuss several weighty matters, about which we may have wide differences of opinion, it is inevitable that some of us may find ourselves in a minority. Where there is divided voting, some of us must hold a view which will be defeated. But there is a way in which we may all win. If each one of us, instead of becoming absorbed in one side or other of each question, determines rather that the main matter is that Theosophical principles shall prevail, that we shall act in a Theosophical way, then each of us may gain a success as complete as that which we look forward to, for the whole Society in this Convention."

TEMPORARY ORGANIZATION.

Mr. Johnston then called for nominations for temporary Chairman and temporary Secretary of the Convention.

Upon motion the Acting President of the Dayton Branch, Mr. W. V. Nicum, was unanimously elected temporary Chairman, and Mrs. Nicum, temporary Secretary.

Mr. Nicum assumed the Chair and welcomed the delegates to Dayton.

Upon motion the Chair appointed a Committee on Credentials, consisting of Dr. Tenney, of Cincinnati; Mr. Bruce, of Indianapolis; Mr. Vermillion, of Dayton, and the Treasurer of the Society, Mr. Mitchell, of New York.

Pending the report of the Committee on Credentials, the Convention was addressed upon the subject of Branch work by

Mrs. Stouder, of Fort Wayne, Ind.	Mr. Benninger, of Cincinnati, Ohio.
Mrs. Fournier, of Fort Wayne, Ind.	Mr. Mendenhall, of Dayton, Ohio.
Mr. Allen, of Cincinnati, Ohio.	Mrs. Gordon, of Middletown, Ohio.
Mrs. Manning, of Cincinnati, Ohio.	Mrs. Outcalt, of Cincinnati, Ohio.
Mr. Sewell, of Louisville, Ky.	Mrs. Garst, of Dayton, Ohio.
Mr. Mills, of Indianapolis, Ind.	Mr. Brittain, of Dayton, Ohio.
Mr. Butler, of Indianapolis, Ind.	Mr. Manning, of Cincinnati, Ohio.
Dr. Harker, of Dayton, Ohio.	Mr. Garst, of Dayton, Ohio.

Upon motion an adjournment was taken until 3 p. m.

PERMANENT ORGANIZATION.

On re-convening at 3 p. m. the Committee on Credentials submitted the following report:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CREDENTIALS.

<i>Branch Roll.</i>	<i>Place.</i>	<i>Votes.</i>	<i>Delegates or Proxies.</i>
Aurora	Oakland, Cal.	—	—
Baltimore	Baltimore, Md.	—	—
Blavatsky	Washington, D. C.	5	Mr. Johnston.
Blavatsky	Seattle, Wash.	1	Mr. Johnston.
Boston	Boston, Mass.	1	Mr. Johnston.
British National	Great Britain	18	Mr. Mitchell.
Caracas	Caracas, Venezuela.	2	Mr. Johnston.
Cincinnati	Cincinnati, O.	9	Dr. Tenney.
Dayton	Dayton, O.	7	Mr. Mendenhall.
			Mr. Garst.
			Mr. Brittain.
			Mr. Nicum.
			Mr. Vermillion.
			Dr. Harker.
			Mrs. Nicum.
Detroit	Detroit, Mich.	1	Mr. Johnston.
Fort Wayne	Fort Wayne, Ind.	2	Mrs. Fournier.
			Mrs. Stouder.
Indianapolis	Indianapolis, Ind.	5	Mr. Davis.
			Mr. Gorrell.
			Mr. Mills.
			Mr. Butler.
			Mr. Bruce.

<i>Branch Roll.</i>	<i>Place.</i>	<i>Votes.</i>	<i>Delegates or Proxies.</i>
Los Angeles	Los Angeles, Cal.	—	—
Louisville	Louisville, Ky.	1	Mr. Sewell
Middletown	Middletown, O.	2	Mr. Roberts. Mrs. Gordon.
New York	New York, N. Y.	8	Mr. Mitchell. Mr. Johnston.
Providence	Providence, R. I.	4	Mr. Johnston.
Queen City	Seattle, Wash.	2	Mr. Mitchell.
Salt Lake City	Salt Lake City, Utah	1	—
San Pedro	San Pedro, Cal.	4	Mr. Johnston.
Shila	Toledo, O.	—	—
Southern	Greensboro, N. C.	—	—
Stockton	Stockton, Cal.	—	—
Syracuse	Syracuse, N. Y.	—	—
Toronto	Toronto, Canada	—	—
Virya	Denver, Col.	—	—
Berlin	Berlin, Germany	34	Mr. Johnston.
West Berlin	West Berlin, Germany	1	Mr. Johnston.
Flensburg	Flensburg, Germany	5	Mr. Johnston.
Munich	Munich, Germany	2	Mr. Mitchell. Mr. Johnston.
Suhl	Suhl, Germany	4	Mr. Johnston.

Number of Branches in the Society, 31; number of Branches represented by delegates or proxies, 22; number of votes entitled to be cast by properly accredited Branch delegates or proxies present, 119.

(Signed)

W. A. P. TENNEY,
P. L. W. VERMILLION,

F. A. BRUCE,
H. B. MITCHELL.

Committee on Credentials.

In presenting this report, Mr. Mitchell stated, on behalf of the Committee, that as the status of certain foreign Branches had been questioned prior to the Convention, on account of the action of the Executive Committee in adjusting the dues paid by them, the Committee on Credentials had examined the standing of these Branches with great care, and unanimously reported that the provisions of the Constitution and By-Laws had been completely fulfilled and that their standing was entirely regular.

Upon motion the report was accepted and the Committee on Credentials discharged with thanks.

The Chair then called for nominations for permanent Chairman.

Upon nomination of Dr. Tenney, Mr. Albert Mendenhall, of Dayton, Ohio, was unanimously elected permanent Chairman.

Mr. H. F. Hohnstedt, being duly nominated, was unanimously elected permanent Secretary.

Upon motion of Mr. Johnston a vote of thanks was proffered to Mr. and Mrs. Nicum for their efficient services as temporary officers of the Convention.

Upon motion the Chair appointed as a Committee on Resolutions:

Mr. Charles Johnston, Miss M. D. Hohnstedt, Mr. Jesse Sewell.

And as a Committee on Nominations:

Mr. F. Benninger, Mrs. A. A. Outcalt, Mrs. L. F. Stouder.

Upon motion of Mr. Mitchell the reports of the Secretary and Treasurer were ordered read "out of order," owing to the participation of the Chairman of the Executive Committee in the deliberations of the Committee on Resolutions.

On behalf of the Secretary the following report was presented and read:

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY, T. S. A.

April 27, 1907, to April 25, 1908.

New Branches and Members.

Since the last Convention, charters have been issued to five (5) new Branches, as follows:

The Salt Lake City Branch, chartered May 8, 1907.

The Stockton (Cal.) Branch, chartered May 13, 1907.

The Southern T. S. (Greensboro, N. C.), chartered November 12, 1907.

The Shila Branch (Toledo, Ohio), chartered March 3, 1908.

The Providence (R. I.) Branch, chartered April 14, 1908.

Three hundred (300) new members have received diplomas in the T. S. A., as follows:

In America	61
In England	14
In Germany	225
Total	300

During the same period the Society lost, through resignation, 8; and through death, 7. Total, 15.

Making a net gain in membership during the year of two hundred and eighty-five (285).

This increase is greatly in excess of that for any year in the past decade, and should be a matter of congratulation and encouragement to all members.

Mailing List.

It is again necessary to call attention of members to the need of notifying the Secretary promptly of any change of address, in order that the *Theosophical Quarterly* and other of the Society's papers may reach them safely. Carelessness or forgetfulness in this always greatly increases the work of the Secretary and often makes it impossible to communicate with the member in question.

Correspondence.

The number of letters sent and received by the Secretary has grown year by year—and a constantly increased use is being made of the Secretary's office by members and inquirers.

The Sale of Books.

The sale of books dealing with Theosophical subjects has also steadily increased. Arrangements have been made with the leading publishers whereby any book not in stock may be promptly supplied and members are requested to help in this work by sending their book orders through the Secretary's office. All profits from these sales are devoted to the publication of Theosophical literature.

The Theosophical Quarterly.

Through the interest and co-operation of several Branches and many individual members, the Secretary is able to report that the Society's magazine can now be found in the reading rooms of the chief libraries in America and England, and many letters have been received telling of the appreciative use that is there made of it. The circulation of the magazine has also been greatly increased.

A Word Personal.

I wish to express my appreciation of the help, encouragement and support so freely given by the Branches and members, and gratefully to acknowledge the constant and untiring aid given me by my co-workers in office who have always so promptly and fully responded to my appeal for help and advice and encouraged me by their patience and confidence.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signed] ADA GREGG,
Secretary, T. S. A.

Upon motion of Dr. Tenney, the Secretary's report was accepted and ordered spread upon the minutes.

Upon motion of Mr. Garst a vote of thanks was unanimously extended to Mrs. Gregg for her faithful and efficient services as Secretary of the Society.

Mr. Mitchell, as Treasurer for the preceding year, presented the following report:

REPORT OF THE TREASURER, T. S. A.

April 27, 1907 to April 23, 1908.

STATEMENT.			
<i>Receipts.</i>		<i>Disbursements.</i>	
Dues	\$629.00	Convention, 1907	\$18.50
Donations	368.14	Secretary's Office	281.75
"Theosophical Quarterly"....	483.09	Treasurer's Office	7.50
Express Refund	1.50	"Theosophical Quarterly" ...	1,194.79
	<hr/>		<hr/>
	\$1,481.73		\$1,502.54
Balance on hand April 27, 1907	282.13	Balance on hand April 23, 1908	261.32
	<hr/>		<hr/>
	\$1,763.86		\$1,763.86
 <i>Assets.</i>		 <i>Liabilities.</i>	
Cash on hand April 23, 1908..	\$261.32	Bills payable April 23, 1908,	
Deficit	140.93	"Theosophical Quarterly,"	
		April, 1908, issue.....	\$372.25
		Secretary's Office, April, 1908,	
		Expenses (Estimated)	30.00
	<hr/>		<hr/>
	\$402.25		\$402.25

April 23, 1908.

[Signed] H. B. MITCHELL,
Treasurer, T. S. A.

In submitting this statement of the finances of the Society, the Treasurer desires also to lay before the Convention certain matters concerning his conduct as Treasurer during the last five years.

The report of the Ninth Annual Convention of the Theosophical Society in America (THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. I, p. 29) shows that when annual dues were re-established it was clearly understood and stated that this action was not intended to exclude anyone from membership on account of poverty, and that "there were always ways of remitting the dues of members who could not afford to pay." In the Constitution and By-Laws, adopted two years ago, explicit provision is made for the remission of the dues of Branch members, but no explicit provision is made

for members-at-large. The Treasurer has, therefore, with the consent of the Executive Committee, guided his action upon the principles clearly expressed in the Convention of 1903, and has each year, with the consent of the Executive Committee, marked the cards of several members-at-large, "excused from dues," when the member in question was known to be unable to afford even the small sum of \$2. This action amounted to the whole Society treating certain of its members-at-large in the same manner as the Branches of the Society are authorized to treat their members, and is the equivalent of the payment of the dues of the member in question from the General Fund of the Society—to which Fund the dues return. The Executive Committee and the Treasurer have considered that the expressed intent of the Society when dues were re-established, and the provisions of By-Law 13 regarding the expenditure of the General Fund, made this course not only proper but incumbent upon them in cases of earnest workers in genuine poverty. As, however, this action has recently been challenged, the Treasurer gives notice of his purpose to move, at the proper time, an amendment to the By-Laws, by the addition of a new By-Law to read:

"34. The Executive Committee shall have the power to reduce or remit dues in exceptional cases."

The Treasurer asks that the acceptance or rejection of this report carry with it the approval or censure of the Convention as to his action in these matters.

[Signed] H. B. MITCHELL,
Treasurer, T. S. A.

Upon motion of Dr. Tenney, the Treasurer's report was unanimously approved, and ordered spread upon the minutes.

Upon motion of Mr. Garst a vote of thanks was unanimously tendered to Mr. Mitchell for his services as Treasurer and for the conduct of that office.

Dr. Tenney, Mr. Nicum, and Mr. Lyons addressed the Convention upon the subject of the deficit shown in the Treasurer's report; and it was urged that each member contribute what he can toward the expenses of the Society, thereby relieving the few who are at present carrying most of the burden.

In response to an inquiry as to whether it would not be possible to raise the dues or devise other means whereby a deficit might be avoided in the future, Mr. Mitchell stated that the vitality and life of the Society had always depended upon the voluntary contributions of the members. It was the power of the heart, the joy of the members in the work for the work's sake and their willingness to sacrifice therefor, that was and would always remain the great asset of the Society, and this was true not only in its financial affairs but in all its activities. Mr. Mitchell believed that no more could be *required* from the members than the dues now set, but that if a system of mite-boxes was established the voluntary contributions could be largely increased without undue demands upon the members' resources. He was confident that now the need of the Treasury was known, the members would respond to meet that need.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

The Committee on Resolutions then reported, through its Chairman, Mr. Johnston, who said:

"The first matter on which your committee has to report, is a resolution which has stood over since the last Convention. Those who were at that Convention will remember that it was then pointed out that our name, 'The Theosophical Society in America,' no longer described us correctly. A large number of Theosophical students in England had sought and obtained a closer union with us, and a body of students in Germany had done the same. We had also members in France, in Scandinavia,

Venezuela, Canada, and elsewhere outside the United States. It was, therefore, suggested that we should drop the words 'in America' from our title. To this proposal there was some opposition, though a great majority of our members favored the change. The Convention was asked to postpone action, to give the small minority ample time to consider the whole question; and this the Convention cordially consented to do.

"The matter therefore comes up again to-day. During the year that has passed, the reasons for making the change have grown stronger. We have had a large increase of membership in England, and an increase of over 200 members in Germany, all of whom wish to be members of an avowedly international Society. On the other hand, many of those who objected to the change a year ago have since changed their view, and opposition is now almost wholly confined to a section of the Pacific coast.

"In reporting on this Resolution, your Committee further holds that the Founders evidently contemplated the formation of an international Society from the outset; all the earlier Branches outside the United States were organized by Mme. Blavatsky in person, as Corresponding Secretary, and she herself directed and mailed the diplomas to the earlier members in other lands. It was intended to form, not a series of national centres, but a nucleus of universal brotherhood, without distinction of race or tongue or land, a brotherhood that should embrace all humanity.

"Again, it is suggested that, while the name, 'The Theosophical Society,' does correctly describe our organization, it is already used by another body, and is therefore pre-empted. But many of us, who have been long enough in the movement to have taken part in its eventful early days, hold that we joined 'The Theosophical Society,' and that, as we have always tried to work for its purposes, and abide by its principles, we have never ceased to be members of 'The Theosophical Society,' and are, therefore, entitled to that name. It will be remembered that, when 'The Theosophical Society in America' became an autonomous body at the Boston Convention of 1895, Mr. Judge was accused of appropriating the name, seal and motto to which Colonel Olcott laid exclusive claim. Mr. Judge then replied: 'It is not Theosophy nor conducive to its spread to make legal claims to theosophical names, symbols and seals so as to prevent, if possible, others from using them. Everyone should be invited to use our Theosophical property as freely as he wishes.' This shows the view held on the question of pre-emption by Mr. Judge.

"Finally, it is suggested that our dropping the words 'in America' from our title may cause confusion and misunderstanding. We think this is largely imaginary. Our members in New York have for years called themselves 'The New York Theosophical Society,' and no confusion whatever has arisen. We therefore report in favor of the resolution:

"Resolved, That the words 'in America' be dropped from the title of the Society."

Mr. Bruce asked if it was known whether the opposition to this resolution had increased or decreased since the last Convention.

Mr. Johnston replied that a year ago the opposition to resuming the original name of the Society had chiefly centered in one or two Branches on the Pacific coast. This opposition had remained unchanged, but he believed the general sentiment in favor of the resolution throughout the Society was even stronger than at the last Convention.

The Chairman remarked that the chief opponents of the resolutions were neither present nor had sent proxies.

Upon motion of Mr. Mitchell the vote was taken upon the resolution by roll call.

Roll Call Upon Resolution:

Resolved, That the words "in America" be dropped from the title of the Society.

<i>Branch.</i>	<i>Ayes. Noes.</i>	
Blavatsky (Washington)	5	—
Blavatsky (Seattle)	1	—
Boston	—	—
British National	16	2
Caracas	2	—
Cincinnati	9	—
Dayton	7	—
Detroit	1	—
Fort Wayne	2	—
Indianapolis	5	—
Louisville	1	—
Middletown	2	—
New York	8	—
Providence	4	—
Queen City	2	—
San Pedro	—	4
Berlin	34	—
West Berlin	1	—
Flensburg	5	—
Munich	2	—
Neusalz	1	—
Suhl	4	—
	<hr/> 112	<hr/> 6

The Chair declared the resolution carried with 112 ayes, 6 nos, and 1 not voting.

On behalf of the Committee on Resolutions, Mr. Johnston then presented the resolution offered by Mr. Howerton of San Pedro, California:

"Be it Resolved, That the basis for representation shall be by individual voting and proxies; every member in good standing being allowed to vote; and

"Be it Further Resolved, That the Constitution of the T. S. in A. be revised to conform thereto."

Mr. Johnston read the following communication from the San Pedro Branch:

"The (San Pedro) Branch is in favor of the resolution by Mr. Howerton *in re* individual voting, for the reason that then a Branch would have a voting power equal to the number of its members; (as it is now, a Branch of five members has no greater power than a Branch of three members, although it is nearly twice as large, which we deem unjust and unwise;) and for the further reason that then members-at-large can vote if they so desire. We believe it is manifestly wrong to keep members who are not members of Branches from voting and taking part at Conventions. It may stimulate the formation of Branches to vote as we do, but it is not right to do wrong that good may result, and the end does not always justify the means, as we are well aware."

Commenting on this, Mr. Johnston said: "The question before us is an important and somewhat difficult one. We may gain light on it, by inquiring what the practice was in the early days of the Society, the times of H. P. B. and W. Q. Judge. We find that, during all the earlier life of the Society, voting at Conventions was always by Branches, and I have had the honor of thus voting for Mme. Blavatsky,

as a delegate to the Convention of 1888, from the Branch to which she belonged. When W. Q. Judge organized the members in this country as a self-governing body, he also supported voting by Branches. Mr. Judge always spoke of the Society as 'a Federation of autonomous Branches,' not as an assembly of individual members.

"We may be certain that H. P. B. and Judge had very good reasons for supporting Branch voting. We may conjecture that these reasons were somewhat as follows. Humanity has, so far, reached the point of personal, separate consciousness, the consciousness of the individual. We are destined in time to reach the consciousness of the Logos, a divine, collective consciousness, in which all shall be 'made perfect in one.' From the separate personal consciousness to that ultimate divine consciousness, the first step is a collective consciousness of three or more, working together for some high and ideal aim, and thus entering into a collective spiritual life. But to form such a life, all must be independent, self-reliant individuals, each standing on his own feet, each enjoying full spiritual liberty. And this individual freedom and self-reliance are secured to all members within the Branch, where they are guaranteed perfect freedom of thought and expression, on condition of giving like freedom to others. So that a Branch of three or more is the first field in which the higher collective consciousness can find expression; and in the Conventions of the Society such a Branch can find collective expression as a unit; and several Branches can come into relation with each other, as a larger collective consciousness. Thus we give scope both to individual and collective life; the former being provided for by individual voting within Branches, and the latter by Branch voting at Conventions; and in this way our members have practical training in the formation of 'a nucleus of universal brotherhood,' and the collective activity of such a nucleus. This would seem to be the reason why voting by Branches was always the rule, and was endorsed by H. P. B. and W. Q. Judge.

"As to the point that a Branch of five has no larger representation than a Branch of three, it should be remembered that what is sought is not an expression of individualism, but the expression of a collective life and consciousness; and this is gained, whether the Branch consist of three or five. And it is difficult to believe that, if there were five members full of Theosophical vigor and zeal, they would not presently attract a sixth, and thus secure larger representation, if they felt this important to their work. As to the members-at-large being deprived of votes, the answer is very simple. No one need be deprived of a vote, unless he himself wishes. For, by becoming a member of a territorial branch, or a corresponding member of a local Branch, he can at once enter Branch life, and thus secure representation and voting power. But a large number of members-at-large do not care to do this. Within the last few months, all were written to, and it was suggested that they should form Branches or become corresponding members of existing Branches. Hardly one in five replied, thus showing that they were very little concerned about representation. Very much the same class failed to sign and send in their proxies, in the days of individual voting."

The Committee on Resolutions therefore thinks right to offer the following amendment to Mr. Howerton's resolution, by striking out all that follows the first "Be it Resolved," and adding the words: "That the system of voting at Convention remain unchanged."

After discussion by Dr. Tenney, Mr. Mitchell, Mrs. Orr, and others, the vote being taken upon the motion to amend, the amendment was carried.

The question recurring upon the resolution as amended, upon motion of Mr. Mitchell the vote was taken by calling the roll, with the following result:

Roll Call upon Resolution.

"Be it Resolved, That the system of voting at Conventions remain unchanged."

<i>Branch.</i>	<i>Ayes. Noes.</i>	
Blavatsky (Washington)	5	—
Blavatsky (Seattle)	1	—
Boston	1	—
British National	17	1
Caracas	—	2
Cincinnati	8	1
Dayton	7	—
Detroit	1	—
Fort Wayne	2	—
Indianapolis	4	1
Louisville	1	—
Middletown	2	—
New York	8	—
Providence	4	—
Queen City	2	—
San Pedro	—	4
Berlin	9	25
West Berlin	1	—
Flensburg	—	5
Munich	2	—
Neusalz	1	—
Suhl	—	4
	<hr/> 76	<hr/> 43

The Chair announced the resolution carried: 76 ayes, 43 noes.

The Committee on Resolutions then reported on the resolutions sent to Branches some time previously by the Los Angelenos Branch, at Los Angeles. It was found that this Branch was not represented at the Convention, either by delegates or by proxy, so that technically there was no one to propose these resolutions. The Committee, however, held that it was evidently the intention and wish of the Los Angelenos Branch that these resolutions should be brought before the Convention, and decided to report in that sense.

On behalf of the Committee on Resolutions, Mr. Johnston read the resolutions of the Los Angelenos Branch, and also a letter from the English National Branch, commenting on these resolutions. The resolutions proposed that four By-Laws, Nos. 1, 4, 14, and 29, should be abrogated, and that By-Law 36 should be amended, to read as follows: "All officers and committees shall make reports of their proceedings annually to the Convention; and such proceedings shall be subject to the confirmation and approval of said Convention."

Mr. Johnston pointed out that the By-Laws proposed to be abrogated (Nos. 1, 4, 14 and 29) were in no sense new, but had been a part of the organization of the T. S. A. ever since its foundation. Of these four By-Laws, two stood verbally as they are now in the Constitution of 1896, and the other two were the same, but for the omission of the word "President," as the Society no longer has a President. The Society has thus had twelve or thirteen years' experience of the working of these four By-Laws, and no such results as those apprehended by the Los Angelenos Branch have in fact flowed from them.

The committee then took up the By-Laws in question one by one. Mr. Johnston said that, as regards By-Law 1, he, as a member of the Executive Committee,

would decline to cancel any charter or diploma, as he believed this was a responsibility which no individual should be asked to assume. But he held that the Executive Committee should be empowered to *suspend* charters and diplomas, pending action by the Convention. There were possible cases in which individual members or Branches might take action involving the honor of the Society; and in such cases it was imperative that the Society should be protected at once, and without delay. Such prompt action might be the "stitch in time, saving nine." Suspension pending action by the Convention would meet this need perfectly, and would seemingly be in full accord with the spirit of the Constitution.

The Committee on Resolutions then took up By-Law 4. Mr. Johnston pointed out that the scale of incomes in different countries varied greatly, and that any rigid scheme would thus work injustice. On the average, incomes in the United States were three times as high as incomes in England, and four times as high as incomes in Germany. So that a uniform rate of two dollars dues would really be equivalent to dues of six dollars in England, and of eight dollars in Germany. Mr. Johnston stated that should the resolution of the Los Angeles Branch: "*Resolved, That By-Law 4 be abrogated,*" be brought before the Convention he would propose that this resolution be amended so as to read: "*Resolved, That By-Law 4 be amended by the addition of the words: 'with power to adjust dues.'*"

Taking up the remaining resolutions of which the Los Angeles Branch had given notice, the Committee on Resolutions reported that, in their view, these resolutions, if presented to the Convention, should be amended so as to cause By-Laws 14, 29 and 36 to remain unchanged.

Mr. Bruce moved that the report of the Committee on Resolutions be accepted and the questions referred to therein be laid upon the table.

Dr. Tenney moved to substitute the following resolution:

Resolved, That the report of the Committee on Resolutions be accepted and the By-Laws of the Society amended according to the recommendations made therein.

After discussion, Mr. Lyons stated that inasmuch as the Los Angeles Branch had failed to send a delegate or proxy to move the resolutions of which they had given notice, and inasmuch as he deemed it desirable that these questions be definitely settled by the Convention, he would himself move these resolutions, reserving the right to vote against the resolutions or to accept any amendment thereto.

Dr. Tenney withdrew his motion to substitute.

Mr. Bruce withdrew the resolution he had offered.

Mr. Lyons moved that By-Law 1 be abrogated.

Mr. Johnston moved to amend so that the resolution should read:

Resolved, That By-Law 1 be stricken out and the following substituted therefor: "All Charters and Diplomas derive their authority from the Society as a whole, acting through the Executive Committee, and may be suspended by the Executive Committee pending action by the Convention."

Mr. Lyons accepted this amendment.

The vote being taken upon the resolution as amended the resolution was carried.

Mr. Lyons moved that By-Law 4 be abrogated.

Mr. Johnston moved to amend so that the resolution should read:

Resolved, That By-Law 4 be amended by the addition of the words "with power to adjust dues."

Mr. Lyons accepted the amendment. The vote being taken upon the resolution as amended the resolution was carried.

Mr. Lyons moved that By-Laws 14 and 29 be abrogated.

On behalf of the Committee on Resolutions, Mr. Johnston moved to amend so that the resolution should read:

Resolved, That By-Laws 14 and 29 remain unchanged.

Mr. Lyons accepted this amendment.

The vote being taken upon the resolution as amended, the resolution was carried.

Mr. Lyons moved that By-Law 36 be changed to read as follows: "All officers and committees shall make reports of their proceedings annually to the Convention; and such proceedings shall be subject to the confirmation and approval of the said Convention."

On behalf of the Committee on Resolutions Mr. Johnston moved to amend so that the Resolution should read:

Resolved, That By-Law 36 remain unchanged.

Mr. Lyons accepted this amendment.

The vote being taken upon the resolution, as amended, the resolution was carried.

The Chair declared the Report of the Committee on Resolutions accepted and disposed of by the action taken.

Mr. Mitchell moved that the By-Laws be amended by the adoption of a new By-Law to be numbered 34, later By-Laws to receive consecutive numbers, and to read as follows: "The Executive Committee shall have the power to reduce or remit dues in exceptional cases."

The vote being taken the motion was carried.

Mr. Charles Johnston, as Chairman of the Executive Committee, then presented the following report:

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, T. S. IN A.

For the Year 1907-1908.

The Executive Committee is an international body, extending from Germany to California; its members belong to three different countries and six different Branches. It is, therefore, in a very real sense a representative body, reflecting the will and thought of the whole Society between Conventions. The most important work done by the Executive Committee during the past year was the cordial understanding reached with "The Theosophical Society in Germany," under By-Law 4. The German Society had for some time been in correspondence with "The Theosophical Society in America," with the aim of attaining a closer and more intimate union in our common work. At the Convention held in Berlin last Spring, "The Theosophical Society in Germany," by a practically unanimous vote, decided to join us, with the title of "The Theosophical Society, German National Branch;" and diplomas were accordingly issued to all the members of the German Society, who thus became members of "The Theosophical Society in America," and very generously accepted this somewhat anomalous title. The spirit of our German brothers was in the highest degree cordial and Theosophical; and the Executive Committee tried to show the same spirit, in prescribing the manner in which the details of the amalgamation should be carried out, under By-Law 4. When the question of dues was taken up, the Executive Committee had to consider several things. First, the difference of average incomes, the average income in the United States being about four times the average income in Germany; so that \$2 dues in the United States would represent a call on the German income equivalent to \$8. Again, the T. S. in Germany had its own Secretariat, carrying on correspondence with several hundred members and enquirers in German; and publishing a magazine in which were translated for the German reader much of the Theosophical literature appearing in English; and it was seen that this saved the New York headquarters a very considerable sum, to say nothing of the high value of the work itself. We estimated this economy at not less than \$100 a year, and probably a good deal more. Once again, only a minority of our members in Germany are

sufficiently familiar with English to wish to receive THE THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY; and, as the cost of producing the magazine is considerable, we estimated that not less than \$200 a year would thus be saved. In view of these facts, the Executive Committee thought it entirely right to accept the proposal made by "The Theosophical Society in Germany," that, after amalgamation with "The Theosophical Society in America," the German Branches should make an annual contribution to the General Fund in lieu of dues, retaining the remainder of the sum raised from their members for work in Germany. This contribution was, for the present, fixed at \$25. This arrangement was entirely satisfactory to our German brothers, as also to the Executive Committee. And I am confident that this view will be shared by the Society in Convention.

The Executive Committee has also to report that several new Branches were added to the Society during the past year; and that we have had a very considerable accession of new members. The details of this good and encouraging news will be found in the report of the Secretary. The Committee feels that the best thanks of the whole Society are due to the Editor-in-chief of THE THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY, who has so ably and enthusiastically carried out the practical work of issuing our magazine, in the face of many difficulties, not the least of which is the dilatoriness of certain contributors. The details of this work, especially on the financial side, are found in the report of the Treasurer.

In a more personal field, the committee has to report the resignation of one of its members, Mr. J. D. Bond, formerly of Fort Wayne, Ind., who some time ago took up his residence in the Hawaiian Islands. Mr. Bond considered that he was too far away to be able to attend to the business of the committee, and that the long time taken in the transmission of letters might seriously interfere with important business. He therefore suggested that some one at a less distant point should be chosen in his place. In accepting Mr. Bond's resignation, the Executive Committee tendered to him the most hearty thanks of the whole Society for the able work he had done for so long, and with such unfailing devotion. The committee, acting under Article IV, Section 7, of the Constitution, requested Mr. Birger Elwing to take the place vacated by Mr. Bond, until the meeting of the Society in Convention; and this Mr. Elwing very cordially consented to do.

In concluding its report, the Executive Committee feels that at no time have our prospects been so promising as at present. At no time, therefore, has there been such an opening for vigorous Theosophical work.

For the Executive Committee,

CHARLES JOHNSTON,

Chairman.

Upon motion the report of the Executive Committee was accepted with thanks.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS.

The election of officers being next in order the Committee on Nominations presented the following names:

For members of the Executive Committee to serve for three years, and to succeed themselves:

Mr. M. D. Butler, of Indianapolis.

Mr. Albert Mendenhall, of Dayton.

For member of the Executive Committee, to serve for one year, filling the unexpired term of Mr. J. D. Bond, resigned:

Mr. Birger Elwing, of Los Angeles.

For Secretary, to succeed herself:

Mrs. Ada Gregg, of Brooklyn.

For Treasurer, to succeed himself:

Mr. H. B. Mitchell, of New York.

There being no other nominations the Secretary was instructed to cast a single ballot for the above nominees, and the Chair declared them unanimously elected to their respective offices.

Upon motion of Mr. Johnston a vote of thanks was tendered the Dayton press for the kind consideration given the Convention.

Upon motion the Convention adjourned until 8 p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

There being no further stated business before the Convention, the Evening Session was devoted to informal discussion of the work and finances of the Society. Dr. Harker, referring to the annual deficit, recommended the adoption of mite boxes for individual use, the contents to be remitted to the Treasurer semi-annually. Mr. Mitchell heartily approved this course and suggested that the distribution of such mite boxes would be an extremely valuable contribution to the whole Society by any Branch that was willing to undertake it.

Miss Hohnstedt urged that greater use be made by the members of the book department of the Secretary's office, as this helped the Society at no cost to the members.

In the middle of the evening the following letter was received from the Los Angelenos Branch and read by the Chairman to the Convention.

April 17, 1908.

*To Chairman of the Convention, T. S. in A.,
Assembled at Dayton, Ohio:*

GREETING:—

Since the delegate we expected to represent us at the forthcoming Convention is unable to go to Dayton, we ask you, will you most kindly have some one volunteer from those present to present our resolutions to the Convention. For his better guidance we are inclosing copies of the communications sent by us to the several Branches of the T. S. in A. We send you our fullest sympathy in all that tends toward the spread of Theosophic Truth and the betterment of humanity.

Thanking you beforehand for the favor, we are,

Fraternally yours,

LOS ANGELENOS BRANCH, T. S. IN A.

[Signed] M. ELLA PATERSON, *Secretary.*

605 West Third Street, Los Angeles, California.

Upon motion of Mr. Mitchell, the Secretary of the Convention was instructed to reply to the Los Angelenos Branch that, though their letter had been received after the business of the Convention had been transacted, the spirit of their request had fortunately been anticipated and as fully complied with as the circumstances made possible.

The Convention had the pleasure of hearing from Mr. and Mrs. Orr of Columbus, Mr. Lyons of Cincinnati, Miss Ruth Garst of Dayton, Miss Hohnstedt of Cincinnati, Mr. Bruce and Mr. Davis of Indianapolis, and was indebted to Mrs. Nicum and Dr. Garst of Dayton for some enjoyable music.

Upon motion of Dr. Tenney, the Dayton Branch was tendered a unanimous vote of thanks for the cordial and hospitable reception they had extended the visiting delegates and for their thoughtful provision for the success and pleasure of the Convention.

Upon motion of Mr. Johnston, a unanimous vote of thanks was tendered the

presiding officers of the Convention, Mr. Albert Mendenhall and Mr. H. G. Hohnstedt, for their efficient services as Chairman and Secretary.

Upon motion, the Convention adjourned.

Reports and letters of greeting addressed to the Convention are appended.

[Signed] H. G. HOHNSTEDT,

Secretary of the Convention.

On Sunday, April 26th, at 2 p. m., Mr. Mitchell gave a public address under the auspices of the Dayton Branch, upon "*Fundamental Aspects of Religion*," and at 8 p. m., Mr. Charles Johnston lectured on "*What the Theosophical Society is Not*."

Each of these lectures was largely attended both by the visiting delegates and by non-members of the Society.

The addresses are printed elsewhere in this magazine.

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY, ENGLISH BRANCH.

115 Ethel Street, New Benwell, Newcastle-on-Tyne,

April 8, 1908.

DEAR FELLOW MEMBER:

On behalf of the members of the British National Branch of the Theosophical Society in America I have to ask that you will kindly undertake to represent them at the Convention to be held at Dayton, Ohio, on April 25th.

In this capacity will you please convey to your members in Convention assembled our most hearty fraternal greeting and good wishes?

We have to report a year of steady progress: our roll of membership is gradually increasing, and the meetings of our various centres throughout the country all report good and consistent attendances and useful work done.

We view with hearty approval the efforts of your members to bring about such a change in the title of the Theosophical Society in America as will more adequately express its inter-continental character, and we feel that such an inclusive style and title under which the members in the various countries wherein our affiliated branches exist would be enrolled, would go far towards establishing amongst them a most fruitful and helpful "entente."

With the object of furthering and extending inter-communion between the various National Branches our members are wishful that an activity which is at present being developed in our Branch, and in which we have already invited the co-operation of the Branches in Germany, Austria, Norway and Sweden, should be expanded to include the various Branches in the United States. This activity consists in regular periodical correspondence carried on by duly appointed Corresponding Secretaries, and in this connection, through the courtesy of your Secretary, a letter of detailed explanation from this Branch will shortly be circulated to your various centres.

We look forward to a year of increasing work and usefulness, of a clearer and more definite understanding and knowledge of our fellow-workers in other countries, and more especially to a fuller manifestation of Unity in our ranks, towards which we trust your deliberations in Convention will in no little measure tend.

With renewed fraternal greetings, I am,

Cordially and sincerely yours,

EDWARD H. WOOF.

LONDON LODGE.

91 Edgware Road, W.,
April 1, 1908.*To the Members of the T. S. in A.:***GREETING!**

The members of the London Lodge of the T. S. in A., English Branch, desire to express their heartiest good wishes to their brethren assembled in Convention. We feel this to be an opportunity of uniting in spirit with you and with our brethren the world over—of expressing to each other our steadfast adherence to the cause of Theosophy—of cheering the faint-hearted ones—of rousing the lethargic—of uniting in spirit with our steadfast and untiring brethren, and with all men who in all climes are working for the cause of human progression and development. We feel it to be a time of strong faith, of ardent aspiration, of high and unselfish resolve.

During the last year we have carried on our meetings at 46 Brook Street and regular fortnightly public meetings at the Eustace Miles Restaurant. Our meetings have been fairly well attended and we see cause for encouragement and hope in their present success. We have continually emphasised the foundation of our Society upon the basic principle of Universal Brotherhood. We feel that all our failures begin in failure to express this spirit in our lives, and that every success must be founded upon a deeper and truer appreciation of this great principle.

The London Branch has carefully considered several of the questions which will be brought before you for decision. With the proposition which aims at the destruction of some of the powers of the Executive Committee by deleting various clauses from the By-Laws, we do not agree. We believe the By-Laws exist for the government of the Society between Conventions and that this government is necessary to the life and work of the Society. If the executive power is not in the hands of the Committee and its work carefully defined, then, instead of being governed by a representative Committee, the Society would be governed without defined powers by a single executive officer. Our experience in England is entirely opposed to this course.

With regard to the resolution laid on the table at the last Convention we are unanimous in wishing for the change of name, feeling that by such a change of name the true spirit of the Society will be more adequately expressed.

With the proposition for changing the basis of voting we do not agree, because we believe the Society exists not for its individual members, but for the world at large, that the Spirit of the Society inheres not in scattered members but in living Branches carrying on Theosophical work, the whole aim of the Society should therefore be the conservation of such centres of effort and the expression in the government of the Society of the living force of the movement, rather than the expression of the personal conception of individuals.

In thus stating freely the opinions of our Branch we desire that our expression should be interpreted in the light of that spirit of tolerance and Brotherhood which is the basic principle of the Society.

For the members of the London Lodge, I am,

Yours fraternally,

J. W. GORDON KENNEDY.

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY, IN GERMANY.

Berlin, S. W., April 1, 1908.

To the Members of the T. S. in A. in Convention Assembled:

GREETING!

Not being able to bring my greetings to the Convention, I send you by letter

in behalf of your brothers and sisters in Germany the heartiest greetings and good wishes. I hope you—we, I mean—will have a good and successful Convention. It cannot fail to be such a one, if each member takes a deep and earnest interest; our own success, and that of the Convention depends on the state of our minds. At the present time this is even more so than in the days of H. P. B. and W. Q. Judge, when the Great Lodge could work through these agents on the outer plane. But now, since they left our plane, it is the duty of the members to keep their work alive. As I understand it, this duty of the members lies first in an effort to strengthen the *spiritual* part of the movement, and this consists in trying to feel a oneness of heart, in maintaining harmony and brotherly feeling in our ranks and towards all humanity. While it is not possible to attain oneness of mind, we certainly know by experience, that it is thoroughly possible to attain oneness of heart, and we feel that it is the only way to awaken the spiritual and moral faculties of the Soul. If we as members have tried this during the year and we meet then together in the Convention, what great power and energy must then be manifested. Happy must be he, who can be present! So I hope, that not the difference of minds, but the harmony of hearts will prevail in the deliberations of this Convention as in years past, and that this Convention will mark one step in the coming of the Kingdom of Heaven to earth.

I think it will be of interest to you to hear something of the work of your brothers in Germany during the last year.

The best thing that has happened to our T. S. was, that we could unite with the T. S. in A., and thus promote the international character of this T. S. In consequence of this union, the "T. S. in Germany" had to adopt fixed dues; and although these dues were very small, the result was, that many members left our T. S. The T. S. in Germany at present has a total membership of 246 (Branch members and members-at-large); after our next Convention the membership will be much smaller, for reasons above mentioned.

We have at present nine Branches, all very earnest and very active. All of them have weekly public meetings and most of them one or more weekly study classes.

During the summer it was possible for some members in Berlin to visit some Branches in other cities (and *vice versa*); they lectured in public and private meetings, and the results were very encouraging. Generally speaking, the work in Germany is not easy, the public and, of course, the churches are mostly against our movement. The press also is misinformed or has a prejudice against us; it is very inclined to print articles, which misrepresent H. P. B., her life and her work. But all this makes no difference in our efforts; we work on and try to realize the last words of Brother Judge to the members of the T. S.: "Be calm, go slow, work on!"

Once more wishing the Convention the best success in the name of the members of the T. S. in Germany,

I remain sincerely,

PAUL RAATZ, *Secretary*.

BERLIN BRANCH.

Berlin, April 3, 1908.

To the Members of the Theosophical Society in America in Convention Assembled.

DEAR COMRADES:

On behalf of the members of the Berlin Branch, T. S. in Germany, we send you our heartiest greeting to the Convention:

This is the first time we partake as a Branch in the Convention of the T. S. in A., and we feel the deepest satisfaction to be thus also joined in organization

to our American and English brothers and sisters, to whom long before we felt already the greatest sympathy and brotherly love.

In assisting thus for the first time at your Convention, though none of us can be present in person, we trust that the sympathy we will send you at the time of the Convention will help to increase the feeling of unity you are assembled to express, and that whatever deliberations you may take will bear the mark of this spirit of unity.

We are sorry that this is all we can contribute to your work at the present occasion, but we confidently hope that further on we may be granted the possibility of taking a more active part in the affairs and interests of our Mother Society.

As to our activities during the past year, we may say that we have much reason for rejoicing. We gave alternately each Wednesday in our own rooms a public lecture with free discussion, and a meeting for study. At the former themes of general interest on religious, philosophical and ethical questions were treated by members in the light of Theosophy, or lectures were held by outsiders, whom we invited, and which were followed by discussions which tended to show the principles of Theosophy consciously or unconsciously involved in the lectures of the speakers, and to affirm and put clearer these same principles. At the latter, "The Ocean of Theosophy," by Mr. Judge, was studied. Both meetings were throughout very well attended, not only by members, but very largely by strangers, who took an active part and followed the lectures and discussions with great interest. In October last a great meeting in a public hall was held, assisted by about 350 persons. Two lectures on different themes were given, followed by a discussion in which strangers took part, thus giving rise to a further explanation of Theosophical principles, assuredly much misunderstood by the public. We have determined to arrange similar meetings from time to time in order to draw the attention of earnest people more to the principles declared by our society, people who otherwise are too much attracted and misled by the efforts of other societies teaching so-called Occultism, discrediting thus the purposes of the Theosophical Society.

With greeting and best wishes, we are, dear Comrades,
Yours very fraternally,

PAUL RAATZ, *President.*
LEO SCHOCH, *Secretary.*

WEST BERLIN BRANCH.

Schöneberg, den 23rd März, 1908.

To the Secretary of the Convention.

DEAR FELLOW MEMBER:

The undersigned and other members of T. S. Branch West Berlin send kind greetings to the members of the T. S. A. assembled in Convention. Our sympathy and brotherly thoughts will abide among you. Our hope, trust and inner longing are that your inner hearts may be inspired at the consultations. May the undying power of our common "Higher Self" and the wisdom of our "Elder Brothers" and of your own individual souls be with you, so that all high ideas may contribute to further the whole of humanity and to banish harm.

Our special interest is directed, as a year ago, upon the resolution "That, in Article I, Section 1, of the Constitution, the words 'in America,' after 'The T. S.,' be dropped," so that the international character of the same be expressed. We hope that in the present Convention "greater inner harmony" may dominate, so that the resolution may be accepted unanimously.

Further, about "the individual voting and proxy of members in good standing," we think that this could well be accepted generally, but specially only in part,

because time and distance are mighty hindrances in this physical world. We are convinced, too, that only a small part of the members can *ever go in person* to conventions. The voting of the *absent* members by proxy and delegates are also as necessary as now "one delegate for each three members in good standing."

The power of 9 of the By-Laws could here come in question: "Can any member of the Society in good standing, not a delegate or proxy, attend the Conventions . . . *power to vote*," receive?

We are sure that the discussion will make these inquiries clear, and we hope good resolutions will be passed.

Our Branch report is also sent to you herewith. In expectation of your resolutions, we are,

Fraternally,

GUSTAV HÖRICKE.

MAGDALENA BOLDT.

WILLI BOLDT, *President*.

Report to the Members of the T. S. A., Assembled in Convention:

The Theosophical Society, Branch West Berlin, in Schöneberg, has had during the past year, April, 1907, May, 1908:

First weekly and now two weekly meetings, with study of "Key to Theosophy" for our branch members;

Second, every first and third Saturday, study of "Voice of the Silence," from H. P. B., also for members of all branches in Berlin. Our public meetings, with lectures and discussion, are held in a specially hired room, and have been visited by new guests. Our library contains at present 130 volumes. Amendments were made to our Branch Constitution. We have fixed annual dues of twelve marks (about 3 dollars), besides the two marks for every member to the national T. S. in Germany and to the headquarters in New York.

Herein we all feel a great felicitation. Two dollars, according to the Constitution of the T. S. in America, were too much, because most members are married and not rich. The propaganda made is (a) By-weekly reports of our meetings to seven newspapers; (b) By invitations, pamphlets, placards and programmes.

In Summer we had only one lecture monthly. Members and friends of the Branch gave interesting and inviting lectures on the following and other themes:

"Atlantis, A Lost Part of the Earth."

"The Mystery of the Life of Christ."

"The Being of Man."

"Man and His Evolution."

"Forgive Us Our Sins."

"Practical Life Questions."

"About Frederick Nietzsche."

"Theosophy and Matrimony."

W. BOLDT, *President*.

NORTH BERLIN BRANCH.

Berlin N. 54, April 11, 1908.

To the Members of the Theosophical Society in America, with Branches in Other Lands, in Convention Assembled:

To all members attending the Convention of our dear parent Society the members of North Berlin Branch send best greetings and most sincere wishes for successful proceedings.

We have full faith in the events which the future has in store for us and which the resolutions passed by the Convention will bring about in accordance with the Karma of the world and of our Society.

Fraternally,

WILH. CHRISTIE, ANNA JOHN, BERTHA KÖHN, ERNEST JOHN, and others.

FLENSBURG BRANCH.

Flensburg, Germany, April 9, 1908.

To the Convention of the T. S. A., in Dayton, Ohio:

To all Brothers assembled in Convention we send from a distant land our heartiest and most sincere brotherly greetings. May power, insight and endurance be present in richest measure among those who have devoted their efforts to the great work of human Brotherhood. This is the first time that our Society takes part in a Convention, as belonging to the T. S. A., since the union took place only last May. As I believe that our reason for joining will interest all the assembled Brothers, I venture to make the same clear in a few words: When the Masters founded the T. S. in America, this happened not without a definite purpose, and took place because there the proper instruments and the best soil were present. The fact that our American Brothers have preceded us in development by a space of twenty years cannot be considered a matter of slight importance; therefore, we believe we should look trustingly toward America, to our Brothers, in whom we have an unshakable trust. The more we consider this the clearer it becomes to us how right our decision to unite has been.

E. BUHMAN, *Secretary*.

YEAR'S ACTIVITIES OF THE FLENSBURG BRANCH, T. S.

In accordance with your wish, and in order to give you an insight into our work, I willingly present the following data:

Number of members.....	17
Additions during the year	0
Resignations during the year.....	0
General meeting, last May.....	1
Members' meetings (that is, meetings at which matters of less importance are discussed)	3

Since last December we have held open evening meetings, followed by discussion and questions, which have been visited by about thirty-five persons on an average. As we have no specially qualified speakers, we have generally to content ourselves with reading aloud, but this evidently produces a good effect, as we can perceive chiefly from the greater use made of our library. Our weekly meetings, which are generally attended by about eight persons, are generally conducted as follows:

After the opening of the session by the President or Vice-President comes the reading of an extract from the Bhagavad Gita, and a reference to the necessity of beginning spiritual life by brotherly love. Then follows the discussion of business details. And, thirdly, the reading of a paper on some subject decided on beforehand. Then, fourthly, a more intimate discussion.

Since last August we have each week studied *The Key to Theosophy*; but we found that the treatment of the subject was too difficult; so that we would welcome a popular treatment of the work, as a key to *The Key*, in THE THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY. Five or six persons have generally taken part in this study.

Our library consists of 236 volumes, 85 of which have been taken out during the last year. The By-Laws of the Society are being prepared and will shortly be sent to the parent Society.

EGGERT BUHMAN, *Secretary*.

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY IN NORWAY.

Geographic Institute, Christiania,

April 15, 1908.

To the Secretary, T. S. in America:

Having just returned from a journey I hasten to pen these lines, hoping that they will arrive in time for the annual Convention.

If not, does it matter much? Is a simply worded message of great importance? Yes, I think so, if behind the words there be a heart filled with sympathy and love. So I send to you all who are present at the Convention, according to my ability, *greetings*, adding as my sincere hope, that your deliberations and votes may be of powerful help in our future work in the One Universal Theosophical Society.

Fraternally yours,

T. H. KNOFF.

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY IN AMERICA.*

INDIANAPOLIS BRANCH.

The Indianapolis Branch, by unanimous vote, extends to its fellow Branches in Convention assembled its warmest greetings and good wishes, and submits the following brief summary of its year's work:

1. Regular Sunday evening meetings throughout the year, of which not one has been missed. General attendance moderate. Participation in lectures, papers, talks, etc., more complete and evenly distributed than in former years.

2. The Tuesday evening study class has also continued regularly. The attendance at these meetings, however, has been relatively small—sometimes only two or three present. Yet the meetings have been of correspondingly greater interest, in that we reconsidered and re-studied much in the writings of H. P. B. and Mr. Judge—as was also the case with many of our Sunday evening meetings.

3. A Secret Doctrine Class was started about the middle of November, and has also continued with special interest to every one attending. These meetings emphasize again, and in a new way, the great value and helpfulness of united study; and have yielded much even thus far, we believe, in inspiration and true insight into questions and problems which have hitherto seemed very difficult, if not almost wholly inexplicable.

4. The outside work has proceeded in a normal and very encouraging way. Lectures, Papers and Talks have been given to groups and clubs of students, who have united for the purpose of philosophic and religious study; and with these Theosophy has found welcome in every case—as shown by the general inquiry and the increased attendance at the regular Branch meetings (on Sunday evenings especially) and by the increased demand for Theosophical literature.

5. The QUARTERLY has been kept on sale at the news-stands and continued in the public libraries.

Some of the book-stores and stands have sold out completely, while others have disposed of only a very few. General average sales, however, are better than heretofore.

There has also been an extensive introduction and distribution of the QUARTERLY among ministers, students of modern science, professors of literary colleges, dentists, etc. The kindly reception of these, we believe, has been almost

*The Editors regret that the space at their disposal permits the publication only of sample reports from the many American Branches.

unanimous; there has been, however, a few who did not wish the magazine, in which case arrangements were promptly made for its return where stamps were necessary.

As to the regular members of our Branch, I take it that every one of them would gladly express their high appreciation and gratitude to the Quarterly Committee, its contributors, and all concerned with the work of that magazine, for its splendid gifts of the past year, in inspiration, knowledge, and the exceedingly valuable pages, which are of direct and immense help in the fundamental objects of the T. S.

6. The Branch has also distributed through the mails:

(a) Circular letters. (b) Programs. (c) Booklet.

Special mention is made of the sincerity, faith, and warm gratitude of the Indianapolis Branch for the devotion and unceasing efforts of the general officers of the Society, namely, the Secretary, Treasurer, and the Executive Committee.

The recent epoch, completing a period of ten years in the history of the Society's work, has given us much opportunity to consider: first, that the spirit of freedom, the ideals and self-sacrifice of the Founders of the T. S. have been in no wise forgotten; second, that their work is more living to-day than it ever was, if such a thing could be possible, and that explanations are being daily and hourly given setting forth the work of the Society in its true light, and at the same time correcting many erroneous impressions, whereby those who may wish to know the truth of their work, may learn of it; third, to give now, what it may not have been fully possible to give ten years ago: (a) A full recognition of the Constitution of the Society, as given by Its Founders. (b) A complete support of the open platform, which not only recognizes the Universal Brotherhood of Humanity as a divine possibility among men, but also shows it, in a certain sense, to be a law. And lastly, to support firmly and openly the present officers of the Society, to extend to them our best thanks for their work of the past, and such friendly greetings for the present as may help them to that full confidence which they deserve, and should have, in all T. S. matters, in and with the Theosophical Society.

This, together with most fraternal greetings to all Fellow Branches, and to the parent Society as a whole, completes the report from Indianapolis.

Sincerely and fraternally yours,

HERBERT E. DAVIS, *Secretary*.

BLAVATSKY BRANCH.

Washington, D. C., March 26, 1908.

Blavatsky Branch offers the following report of activities during the past season of 1907 and 1908. Under the able leadership of its President these activities have been continuous and successful. This Branch numbers fifteen members, of whom most are regular attendants, and during the past winter has entertained a number of visitors who were attracted by the topics of discussion advertised. Among these topics were the following, chosen at random: "The Purpose of Theosophy," "Physical, Intellectual and Spiritual Evolution," "A Theosophical Interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount," "The Unity of All Religions," "The Other Side of Sleep," "The Problem of the Imperfect," "The Inequalities of Life," "Symbology"; these were all found to bring out an interesting and profitable discussion which would sometimes, at the request of member or visitor, be carried over to the following week, or else a subject of a like nature would be presented. In this manner, attention was called to the fact that all the teachings were but different aspects of the same Basic Principles and the Branch felt that it was in a degree accomplishing its fundamental work, viz., that of establishing a nucleus of Universal Brotherhood,

or Unity of Thought. A good deal of attention has been given to advertising during the past winter; this work has been in the hands of one of our most active members, who has conducted it with such good results, that five advertisements were inserted and five local notices secured during the month of December alone. Blavatsky Branch is the fortunate possessor of a large and complete library of Theosophical books. A rental of five cents a week is charged non-members, and this money is used by the Librarian in acquiring new books as they are issued. The Branch is also fortunate in the possession of a Treasurer who has its interests very near at heart, and who has served continuously for the last ten years. Within the last two years a move has been made to the present location, 1013 L Street, N. W., where much enjoyment has been derived from the hospitality of the President and the commodious quarters furnished. An invitation is extended all visiting members to attend the meetings, held every Thursday evening at eight, and where they will be most cordially welcomed. The following are the list of officers to date: Henry C. Cragin, President; Henry H. Bergmann, Treasurer; Mary P. Trewitt, Secretary; Emma S. Thompson, Librarian; Mattie F. Stamper, Assistant Librarian; Marian F. Gitt, Press Agent.

Very respectfully,

MARY P. TREWITT, *Secretary*.

A GREETING.

Los Angeles, Cal., March, 1908.

To the Officers and Members of the Theosophical Society in America, in Annual Convention Assembled.

GREETING:

We the undersigned members of Los Angelenos Branch, T. S. A., of the City of Los Angeles, and State of California, extend to you individually and collectively our fraternal greeting of good will, and herein express to you our perfect confidence in and loyalty to each and all of you, feeling assured that your deliberation and legislation, of whatsoever a character, will be for the best interests of the Theosophical Society as a whole, embodying a broader scope and field of action toward Universality than has heretofore prevailed, in the fulfillment of the destiny of this great Theosophical Movement, and we will abide by and sustain you in all such action as to time, money, and work.

Sincerely and fraternally,

ALFRED L. LEONARD,
AGNES C. ELWING,

JOS. M. WILLIAMS,
WALTER H. BOX.

JULIA C. MORSE,

A NEW BRANCH.

Since the Convention, the Secretary of the Society reports the issuing of a charter, on May 14, 1908, for the formation of a new Branch at Los Angeles, Calif., to be known as the *Pacific Branch*, and having the following charter members:

Mrs. Agnes C. Elwing,
Mrs. Julia C. Morse,
Mrs. Signe Elwing,
Mr. Berger Elwing,

Mr. Alfred L. Leonard,
Mr. Walter H. Box,
Mr. Jos. M. Williams.

Mrs. M. Ella Patterson and Mrs. Williams have also joined this Branch.

VALUABLE TO ALL STUDENTS OF MYSTICISM
FRAGMENTS

By **CAVÉ**

Collected From

**The Path, The Irish Theosophist, The Theosophical
Forum, The Theosophical Quarterly**

With a Preface and Additional Matter by the Author

Cover Design by Birger Elwing

PRICE, 60 CENTS, POSTPAID

Order from the Secretary, T. S., 159 Warren St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

THE FRUIT OF MANY YEARS' STUDY
The Bhagavad Gita

TRANSLATED BY

CHARLES JOHNSTON

A faithful rendering of the spirit and letter of the original, with a general
introduction and an explanatory introduction to each book, seek-
ing to give the Mystical, Religious, Philosophical, Ethical
and Historical aspects of

THE SONGS OF THE MASTER

PRICE, \$1.00

Order from the Secretary, T. S., 159 Warren St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Talks on Religion

By

HENRY BEDINGER MITCHELL

A Reprint, with added Talks, of the important articles contributed to
THE THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY

These TALKS are a faithful report of the discussions of a group of thinkers,
philosophers and students of religion, and shed much light on
the religious problems of to-day

Published by

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., London and New York

PRICE, \$1.50

Order from the Secretary, T. S., 159 Warren St., Brooklyn, N. Y.



The Theosophical Society, as such, is not responsible for any opinion or declaration in this magazine, by whomsoever expressed, unless contained in an official document.

LOOKING FORWARD.

CONFIDENT hope is the note of the immediate future. All things conspire to secure the success of the Theosophical Movement, and of that greater movement of universal spirituality, of which the Theosophical Movement is so vital a part. Nothing can impede this forward wave, but our own faults and shortcomings. In a certain sense, we are the masters of the future; it is our duty, therefore, as it is our privilege, to spare no pains, no effort, no sacrifice, to do what in us lies, to help forward this auspicious dawn of time.

Let us try to take stock of the varied forces and tendencies in whose presence we find ourselves. And first, as to our own part, the part of those most closely identified with the active, outer work of the Theosophical Movement. It would seem that a very definite and easily intelligible task lies immediately before us. We have studied the theories of the great Eastern Wisdom, with ample assistance from the greatest Teachers of to-day, who have further helped to make intelligible to us the thoughts and ideals of the greatest Teachers of all time. We have gained some insight into the being and the manifestation of the Great Life, and its brooding presence in our lives. We have grasped, at least in theory, the continuous development of our lives, through alternating periods of outward and inward life. And, what is even more remarkable, and in the highest degree encouraging, we have seen the Theosophical view of life permeating the thought and the science of our day; already it rises triumphant over the rapidly disappearing materialism of the past century. As we shall presently see in detail, the splendid impulse of force, sent forth by our great pioneers, has indeed spread abroad through the hearts and minds of men, leaving no field

unpenetrated; and a marvelous revolution of thought and ideals is manifest on all hands.

It is quite evident that this leavening of the world's thought was the task of the last thirty-three years—the first third of the century which began with the founding of the Theosophical Society in 1875. What is the proper task of the second third of this Theosophical century? Clearly, that task is twofold, just as the task of the first third of our century was twofold. Beginning with 1875, the Founders of the Theosophical Movement had to teach the Eastern Wisdom to a few who were ready to devote their lives to the work, in as complete a form, and with as much detail, as the ability of the learners made possible. The founders had, further, to spread broadcast the same Wisdom, but this time in outline only, through the world at large, the scientific and popular thought of our day. As we have seen, and shall shortly consider more fully, both tasks were successful.

By analogy, we can see that the task for the coming period must also be twofold. The theme is now not philosophy, but conduct, applied ethics, the art, rather than the theory of right living. For life is indeed an art, with all the beauty, the inherent sanity, the stable resting on great principles, the profoundly religious inspiration, which belong to all great and true art, and therefore belong especially to the art of life, the supreme art, the fountain and goal of all arts. Conduct, the application to life, to the acts of the will, day by day, of the splendid and far-reaching theories of the Eastern Wisdom: this is our task for the immediate future. And we can see at once that this task must be twofold, as before. First, for those who are willing to dedicate their whole lives to it, heart and soul and mind and strength, there will be the clear and detailed teaching, the daily and hourly discipline, line upon line, and step by step, which will in time give them a mastery over life, just as the student, by daily experiment in the laboratory, gains a mastery of applied chemistry, and can penetrate the secrets of nature's building; adding together or taking away element after element, dissolving and reconstructing, as does Nature herself. There may be a like mastery over the finer and more inward laws; and it is to be gained only by like devotion and implicit obedience.

What mysteries will be revealed to those who will dedicate their whole lives to obedience and devotion, the future will show. But those who have gone before, send us back word that the soul is immortal, its growth and splendor limitless; and this inheritance they

bid us also enter. This, therefore, is the first part of the work that lies before us. The second part, as before, concerns the world at large, its thought and ideals. And as our task is conduct rather than philosophy, we are concerned now not with metaphysics and concepts of science, but with righteousness, justice, mercy, sacrifice. Success will mean that, in the next thirty years, the ideals of conduct which have been taught us will become in a measurable degree the ideals of the world, the practical standard of conduct for the foremost races of mankind.

Success, in some degree, is certain; since success depends here on perfect faithfulness and sacrifice; and those who are behind this great Movement are perfect in faith and sacrifice, as they are perfect in wisdom. We have, in years gone by, come to realise something of what that wisdom means, its scope and splendor and power; we may, if we will, come to realise something of the sacrifice which is the daily life of the Masters, that ceaseless self-devotion which preserves the stars from wrong. There is one way and one way only, whereby we can come into this realization: and that is, by putting into practice, day by day and hour by hour, in our own individual lives, the ideals of righteousness, of justice and of mercy, which have been so clearly, so repeatedly set before us.

Each detail of the art of life is being taught to us. The first truth is Divinity. Life is entrusted to each of us, not that we may gain what we call success, but what is really self-assertion and self-indulgence; but that we may do the will of the Father which is in heaven, and finish His work. In His will is our peace. That is the first great truth, and till it be realised, however imperfectly, both in understanding and in will, in theory and in practice, we can learn nothing of life, nor perform any duty to others, nor confer any benefit on ourselves and others. It is only by obeying the will of the Father, that we come to the new birth through which we enter into spiritual life; and, until we enter into real life, we can render no real service, nor bestow any real love. There are counterfeits of brotherhood, which profess to put love of our neighbor in the first place, ignoring the will of the Father; but these counterfeits soon declare themselves by denouncing those of their brothers who do not agree with them, and, in the name of general love, they practise particular hatred. Of such counterfeits much has been said in warning already; much will, if need arise, be said in the future. We may, therefore, leave them without further comment here. But the principle is plain. The first and greatest commandment is love and

obedience to the will of the Father. And it is by instant obedience to that will that the Masters of all time attain their divinity.

We shall come in time, as we grow in wisdom, to esteem each day as a new opportunity for obedience; another period granted to us to do the will of the Father. For in that will is our peace. In that will is life, since the Father is indeed the infinite Life. Through obedience, therefore, we enter into Life, and draw life into us. The whole structure of our day, and every duty in it, furnish opportunities for learning and obeying the will of the Father. If we are truthful, it is because we are making ourselves of like nature with the Life that is Truth itself, the ultimate Real. If we are holy, it is in virtue of growing oneness with the Holy One. If we are charitable and gentle, it is through something of the Father's love abiding in us, and radiating from us.

So all life is but a training for oneness with the Father, and, as we are untiring and courageous in subduing all the wills of self, and working the will of the Father, we enter deeper into Life, into the Real, into the Immortal. This is the first and greatest commandment. The second is like unto it: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, as being thyself, at heart one with thyself, through oneness with the Father. And here we have no truer oracle than that of the Master of Galilee:—Ye have heard how it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you.

That is the real test of love, that a man shall love his enemies. There is a spurious love, a sectional love, a class love, which often parades under the great name of brotherhood; a local and particular love which is always attended by an equal hatred; so that if a man would be a good Prussian, he must hate France, and if he would be a good European he must hate the Chinamen. But this is no true love at all but an extension of selfishness, a psychic counterfeit. And this will be true of all brotherhood not resting in the deeper and greater love, not based on obedience to the will of the Father. That must come first, ere aught that is true and real can follow.

When we realise what this true love is, we shall come to see how many opportunities are offered by our daily life for putting it into practice. We shall see, as the fundamental truth, that the true benefit, the highest good for each, is, not what he personally may seek for the assuaging of his desires, but rather what the Father has

in store for him, the plan of the Divine, for his growth and development. And, seeing this, we shall have but one wish for others: that they may obey the will of the Father, that the will of the Divine may be worked in them. Once we seize this fundamental truth, the question of our duty to others is immediately made luminous. Our one duty is, to try if haply, through obedience and reverence, we may discern the divine intent for our neighbor, and help him to realise that, and carry it out. This we shall do, as a part of our obedience, always conscious of the Father's love brooding over us like sheltering wings.

In these two laws all laws, human and divine, are included; and the secret for both is the same loving obedience, which brings us into oneness with the Divine Life; that instant obedience which makes the Masters what they are. Our task, and it is a splendid and immortal task, is, first, to bring ourselves under this law of obedience; and then to do all that in us lies to make this high ideal the practical belief of our day for the whole world, just as the principles of our philosophy are becoming the practical basis of all philosophical and scientific thought. No greater privilege could possibly be offered to us, or to the most favored of the children of men, than the opportunity to help, even in the least degree, to bring about so splendid a consummation. Let us see to it, that we walk worthily of our high calling.

And here we may go back to the observation made earlier in these Notes: that, during the last few years, the thought of the world has come round, in a marvelous way, to the fundamental principles of Theosophy. Nowhere is this more striking than in the changing attitude of Christendom toward the teaching of the Master of Galilee. A few years ago, Christianity was held to be a system of transcendental dogmatism, an expressed belief in which, however unintelligible, was the way of salvation for the soul, and this theory of salvation through expressed belief was held equally by the most reactionary of traditional Churches and the most modern of evangelical sects. What was of far greater importance from one point of view, the foremost men of science decidedly rejected this dogmatic system, and ceased to regard the Christian teaching as of serious importance in the total of verifiable truth. The Master of Galilee was looked on as a poetical spirit, one in advance of his time through a certain ethical sensibility and zeal, but one whose views could hardly commend themselves to thoughtful and instructed men.

Fanatical adherence to a system of dogmatics; equally decisive

rejection of this system: these were the two poles of thought regarding the teaching of Jesus. To-day, we behold on all hands a change that is quite revolutionary. In the Churches, the old dogmatical system is not so much rejected as ignored, and allowed to fall into desuetude, while the teaching of the Master, what the Master said of the Father, of his own mission, of life, of the soul, is daily growing in import and significance, as the Churches grow in understanding. It matters not to which of the Churches we turn our attention. In all, the same truth appears. Oriental Catholic, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Lutheran, Evangelical, all are turning their thought, like a strong beam of concentrated light, to the one problem: What was it that the Master really taught? What were the Master's words? What did the Master desire?

And this inquiry is being carried out, not in the mood of casuistry, of barren ecclesiastical science, but in the spirit of life, the spirit of faith, the spirit of love. It is coming to be understood, on all hands, that the one way to learn the true meaning of the Master's commandments, is to obey them. It is coming to be understood that Jesus taught, not a system of dogmatics, but a practical science of life, an experimental knowledge of the spiritual realms in which he himself dwelt, and to which he ceaselessly invited those who would listen to him: "In my Father's house are many mansions. . . . I go to prepare a place for you." Once the idea is fully grasped, that the parables, the Sermon on the Mount, the Discourse of the Last Supper, are practical instructions in the art of life, by the Master of life, his every word will gain a new significance, and those who love him and would be his disciples, will seek to penetrate the meaning of his words, not through theological argument, but through obedience: "If ye love me, keep my commandments."

The significant fact is, not that Theosophists are coming to view the teaching of Jesus in this light, for, as followers of the great science of spiritual things they always held this view, and could hold no other; but that the best men in the Churches, and to some degree the official organisms of the churches themselves, are coming to hold the view, which we can only describe as the Theosophical view of the life and teaching of Jesus. This will mean that, after long centuries of the letter that kills, the churches will begin to find the spirit that gives life, and will thus begin to fulfil the splendid task that was laid upon them by the Master himself, the task of lifting the great burden of the world's materialism, of teaching the living way of spiritual life, of holding up to the world the torch of love and sacrifice, by whose light the Master walked.

This understanding of religion as a practical, experimental science, will greatly change the attitude of the Western religious world toward Eastern religions, and particularly those more mystical religions in which, as students of the Eastern Wisdom, we ourselves are most interested. The experimental test which is being applied to the teaching of Jesus will be applied also to the teaching of Buddha and Krishna and the great Masters of old; and it will be seen that all are but parts of the One Religion, to which all reverence and righteousness have ministered since the world began. Since there are many secrets yet unpenetrated in the mystical Wisdom of the East, this clue, once followed, will be found to lead to new realms of light. "Faith, fervor, service of the Eternal;" this is the motto of the Eastern Wisdom, so that here also applied righteousness, the increase of justice, mercy and loving kindness, will be the practical fruit of deeper knowledge. And this truer understanding of Eastern religions cannot fail to bring a more brotherly regard for the devotees of these religions.

As this new spiritual understanding of life gains strength in men's minds and hearts, the more hidden realms of life will begin to give up their secrets. This we shall probably see progress in two main directions. First, the pioneers of purely physical science will begin to take more and more spiritual views of nature, of force, of matter, slowly working toward the great truth that nature, force, matter, no less than consciousness itself, are but forms of the One Spirit, the One Life, the Eternal. We have already commented on this increasingly spiritual view of manifested things, to which our scientific men of genius are moving, and we shall, without doubt, have cause to comment on it again. What is most vital for us to consider just now is, that this clearing of view will react strongly on the world at large, making easier and more possible that general revolution in favor of applied righteousness, which we look for, as the great reality of the years to come.

The second direction in which we may look for a clearing and deepening of view, is that of psychical science. We look for the more general and intelligent recognition of the reality of thought-transference, clairvoyance, clairaudience; a gradual understanding of the place and character of the psychic body, as a first step toward the recognition of the spiritual body of man, the immortal. As St. Paul said, we shall have "first the psychical and then the spiritual." The progress already made in this direction is marvelous, if we consider the researches of men like Sir Oliver Lodge in England, of Professor Maxwell and Camille Flammarion in France, of Filippo Bottazzi in

Italy, of Wittig in Germany, of Professor Hyslop in America, and many others, who are working with tireless zeal and patience to establish the laws of psychic life.

This work, besides its general significance as showing the world's progress toward a more spiritual view of life, is particularly gratifying to us, for a somewhat more personal reason. We can foresee the time, at no very distant date, when every statement made thirty years ago by H. P. Blavatsky as to the nature of psychic forces will be accepted as a demonstrated fact of science. And we hope also that the day will come, when that great and devoted soul will be vindicated, and shown to be the pioneer and supreme genius, whose great fault was that of all martyrs: that she was too far in advance of her age, and so, martyr-like, was stoned and calumniated. To this theme also we hope to return.

It would be of high value, and it is something which we hope later to be able to do, to show point by point that the popular leaders of psychical science to-day are simply following, with slow and halting gait, the path H. P. Blavatsky traveled more than thirty years ago; and that their discoveries, so far as they are valid, were all anticipated a quarter of a century ago in her published works. And, just as Alfred Russel Wallace, Professor Crookes, and Camille Flammarion, great pioneers of an earlier time, now see their work vindicated and accepted, and their psychical experiments verified, so we confidently hope to see the vindication of H. P. Blavatsky, whom we hold to be greater than them all. And that vindication will be important, not so much as corroborating what she taught of psychical science, as because it will give wider authority to what she has told us, of spiritual life.

"First the psychical," St. Paul says, "and then the spiritual." And we shall no doubt see this verified in a remarkable way, in the work of our psychical pioneers. It is, of course, notorious that the immense popular interest which now rewards these researches, is called forth, not by the hope of learning the recondite secrets of astral vibrations, but rather by the hope of proving that the dead live again. Sir Oliver Lodge is hailed as the great revealer, not because he has some new view of the process of telepathy, but because he affirms that he has experimental proof of the reality of communication with the dead. He has given the names of well known men, saying that he has received intelligent messages from them, since their deaths, messages which are genuine and authentic. And he holds out hopes of greater demonstrations in the time to come.

Here follows a truth of the utmost importance. Those who have been most intelligently occupied with these researches are coming to two conclusions. The first is, that genuine communications are in certain cases received from the dead, under circumstances which admit of no doubt of their authenticity. The second conclusion is, that the vast majority of these communications, whether received through trance speaking, trance writing, or raps, are either irrelevant twaddle or deliberate falsification. And the character of the "controls" is gradually coming to be better understood. Thus the leader of the band of "spirits" which are giving the most remarkable "demonstrations" to-day is a young man who died a violent death, after a wild and dissipated life. And the chief "control" in another group of highly interesting "spirit-writings," is a self-confessed liar and murderer, who paid for his crimes on the scaffold. Our psychical researchers do not yet realise the full significance of facts like these, but the time is not far distant when they will; and this full realisation, which H. P. Blavatsky anticipated more than thirty years ago, will lead, we hope, to certain most important results.

The real interest of the public in all these experiments is, that they ardently long for scientific proof of immortality. Feeling, in their hearts, the unappeaseable thirst for life everlasting, the men and women of our day have fixed their eyes on the psychical pioneers, in the hope that through them the desire of their hearts may be vindicated. Those who thus seek, will gain a certainty of survival after death; indeed, many have gained such a certainty already. But they will also learn that the threshold of the psychical world, across which these pioneers are penetrating, is tenanted by "lying spirits," by the wraiths of murderers and suicides, who enter into these communications solely to come once more into touch with the things of earth, and not the least from love of light and truth.

We foresee a strong reaction from the present wave of popular enthusiasm for "psychical research." The true character of this groping in astral charnel houses will be realised; and with this must come the realisation that there is but one true way to learn concerning spiritual things, and that this way lies through purity, self-sacrifice, and the daily crucifying of the personal self to the immortal. Only the baser secrets of the hidden realms can be gained by our modern necromancers. They will discover that the true light to guide their steps through the darkness is, not the desire for curious knowledge, but that love of holiness, which awakens the true spiritual man, the immortal; and it is only to the eyes of the spiritual man that the real secrets of immortality can be revealed. Here also, as before, we find that the authentic note of the future is the inspiration "to do the will of the Father, and finish His work."

MARTHA AND MARY.

"Now as they went on their way, he entered into a certain village: and a certain woman named Martha received him into her house. And she had a sister called Mary, which also sat at the Lord's feet, and heard his word. But Martha was cumbered about much serving; and she came up to him, and said, Lord, dost thou not care that my sister did leave me to serve alone? bid her therefore that she help me. But the Lord answered and said unto her, Martha, Martha, thou art anxious and troubled about many things: but one thing is needful: for Mary hath chosen the good part, which shall not be taken away from her." (Gospel of St. Luke, Ch. 10, v. 38-42, R. V.)

AS we read this brief narrative, most of us are prone to sympathize deeply with Martha. We are transported, in thought, to that ancient day, and see this woman, cumbered ("distracted" the Greek version is credited with saying) with many matters; anxious, even as we should be, that this wondrous guest—"the Lord"—should be adequately served. We realize that this was indeed "*distraction*" which prompted Martha to bring her domestic troubles to the holy guest and to ask for his rebuke upon her sister. It is under the reproach of this latter fact that we begin to question the matter, to investigate this situation of Martha's, asking if it were indeed so burdensome as it appeared to her to be. Even upon investigation, it has, to some extent at least, our sympathy.

Sympathize with Martha we well may do, for her position is ours to-day; and yet we may easily see that she and we have erred together.

It was not alone for the right service of the Lord that Martha was cumbered. She was troubled about "many things." And in her anxious, "distracted" condition, she would seem to have lost sight of all sympathy for Mary; of all toleration for Mary's view; of all broad-mindedness. This intolerance worked within her heart and bred anger there, as intolerance always does; from anger, as the Bhagavad Gita points out, comes "loss of memory," so that Martha forgot the rights of others besides Mary; she intruded upon her guest, the resting Lord, with the request that he should rebuke one to whom his rebuke would come as an unequaled blow. We have been in some such case ourselves, upon forgetting the "one thing needful." And we may esteem ourselves happy if the Lord's reply has come to us as clearly, echoing down the centuries, reverberating within our hearts as a reminder of the one necessary thing.

In this parable of the two sisters many theosophists see the meaning to be that there are two minds in man—the upper mind and the lower. The upper or higher mind is intent upon the Soul and its Light: tranquil, therefore; watchful; sitting ever “at the feet” of the holy inward messengers, ready to be taught of these or of the Teachers, and the “spiritual pastors and masters;” ready to receive as it may, knowing well that the highest knowledge is as yet beyond it, thankful to receive “at the feet”—or in its lowly condition—all that the Lord may give of such teaching as he knows it can receive. Obedience. Trust. Attention. Concentration. Devotion. Hope. Love. These are the spiritual attributes of the higher mind.

The lower mind of mankind, on the contrary, has lost hold of faith and has entered into anxiety and fear; it has forgotten that “one thing needful,” complete attention to the teaching of the Soul. Alarmed, confused, distraught, void of trust, empty of obedience and charity, it assumes an over-weening importance for its own point of view, and, asking for the rebuke upon another who is contrary-minded to itself, it draws down upon its own conditions the gentle but sorrowful rebuke of the Soul.

The Lord did not say that Martha did wrongly in pursuing her avocations. What he told her was that there is “one thing needful;” that, naming this, Mary “hath chosen the good path, which shall not be taken away from her.” No rebuke of His should fall upon that concentrated and patient attention, that watchfulness of His behest, or, failing that, of his silence, more eloquent still to the expectant disciple. Could not Martha, then, introduce into her associations, occupied as she still was with the affairs of the outer life, that one needful thing? Called still to serve upon the material side of life, was attentive trust forbidden her?

If we are candid with ourselves we come to see with startling clearness that this is not forbidden us, this precious, necessary, unique thing. Our duties are here, at banquet, bed and board; in squalor, in wealth; in the mart, the counting house, the hospital or the Senate. Everywhere our life duties, the true guardians of our veritable freedom, go with us side by side. They—they alone, at first—are our guides, our teachers, our angels; their ready hands hold the keys to all our perplexities and difficulties; could we but view them largely, attentively, impersonally, as parts of a great, continuous whole, we should see in them our revelations, our rich opportunities.

The ceaseless activity of the lower mind obscures this clear vision. Anxiety, doubt, impatience, intolerance and the rest of that astral brood are forces; forces which throw up deadening mists; foul miasmas; the

blackness of night; the breath and sounds of hell. Endless clamor; nerve-wracking jars and discords; debate, dissension, struggle with the stillness of the attentive higher mind, intent upon one thing only, the one thing needful; *the meaning of the Master-Soul*. Surely we can carry into our daily lives the earnestness of this attitude, bringing to bear upon our confusions, and apparently, impenetrable night, the clear, sweet light of the attentive heart. Not that we should abandon a single duty, but that we should enhance every duty; not that we should cease from action, but that we should discover that jewel without price—Right Action, in Soul-light. "If you have patience and devotion you will understand these things, especially if you think much of them and meditate on them, for you have no conception of the *power of meditation*."

When the Church says: "Let us pray!" are we then so sure that she does not mean: "Let us meditate"?

One, after meditating, said: "The moment we *go inside*, we feel that deep, strange sense of adoration. Even the surface is affected by it, and is more composed. Not serene, as yet, but now and again mirroring some great heights before the ruffled mental surface breaks up the image. One way in which this manifests is, in a greater sensitiveness to 'small' duties; to the 'little' things. Outwardly, one is here, where one is, perhaps, quite alone. But really, one feels that no moment need be without *some* work for the Master (who *is* the Soul), were it but a smile bestowed in that name; a flower given with the thought of his great bestowals; one's heart gluttoned, one's mind controlled, for his sake! It is the love with which a thing—any mortal thing—is done, or prompted, which counts. One is far, far from feeling such love as is divine; and yet one has conceived of it, one reaches towards it, one has taken the first step along the path leading to it, the moment one begins to realize how short of that holy love one falls.

"We are labourers, each one having his own small plot to till, a slice taken from Nature and possessed partially by each, full of strange seeds, and weeds, and some—perhaps a very little—grain, mixed with chaff. This plot is 'mine,' we may say, but is not 'myself.' Therefore I will not identify myself with this, my chosen (or appointed) plot of lower Nature. I will till it, looking to the Master-Soul and not dwelling upon its imperfections. If I consider *these*, allied to the might and power of Nature, I were utterly undone. However short it may fall, however great the shortcomings of that labourer who is my inner self, I will not dwell

upon these weaknesses and shortcomings but—once for all acknowledging them—I will put them by, lest the mist of my own grief dim for me the vision of His face.

“It reminds me of Mary—who would seem to have left some things undone, God wot—and under the reproaches of Martha, to gaze into the Master’s face and hear His word. One sympathises with Martha; doubtless there were many things to be done. But if, in the doing of apparently necessary tasks one were to lose the vision of His face! The one thing needful is to look to Him; each must find his own way of looking. That in us which yearns towards Him is divine in essence—that I know. I had rather keep on looking at that, strengthening that, feeling that to be His call in me, and not identifying myself with the lower forces of Nature as these sweep temporarily through my consciousness and invade my mind. ‘I am not the emotions, the passions, the desires.’ So why harbour a sense of guilt, of sin? That, too, is folly; for self is the one Great Folly, *The Sin*. ‘I will arise, and go unto my Father.’ I will attend to the teaching of the soul within the small round of my daily life and push on calmly, without confusion, as without discord or fear.”

This voice rings clear and true. It is the lower mind—the Martha of our human nature—which imports discord, waste and doubt—with wrath—where earnest *attention* to the still small voice alone should be. Light upon each problem, each care, is there, were it only the light of an attentive, watchful calm. In calm is all. *Poise* is the attitude of the soul ready to take its flight into heavenly regions. And to that meditative and constant calm, let us add cheerfulness. For it is true to-day, since it is true for all time, that “the Lord loveth a cheerful giver.” Aye, “*loveth*”; that is in very truth the true word.

JASPER NIEMAND.

“Take courage and turn your troubles, which are without remedy, into material for spiritual progress.”—St. Francis de Sales.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE CHURCHES.*

THEOSOPHISTS are concerned with the spiritual life of humanity as a whole. They are interested in all religions in so far as these promote, or can be made to promote, the development of that spiritual life. Some of us have an especial love for Buddhism; others for what little is known of the religion of ancient Egypt; others for some off-shoot of Hinduism, such as the Vedanta philosophy. But the vital fact remains that we who were born in Europe or America were not born here by chance, and that the religious language of our inheritance and environment is not Buddhist nor Egyptian nor Hindu, but Christian. Would we convert Europe and America to the use of Hindustani or of Chinese, to the abandonment of English and French and German? Would we abolish the existing tongues, which, be it remembered, are natural growths, and persuade humanity to the use of Esperanto or Volapuk? We know better. We know that Theosophy was never propounded as a new religion, but as a method of interpreting all religions; as a very ancient interpretation, not only of religions, but of the symbolism of nature—physical, mental and spiritual. So, in China, we should be able to use the terminology (the symbolism) of Confucius or of Lao-tsze; in India, we should be able to speak indifferently in the language of Shankaracharya or of Ramanuja, of Shandilya or of Narada—always for the purpose of upholding the highest ideal which we can discover, with the aid of Theosophy, in the forms and symbols which we find in use. Should we do less for Christianity?

But then arises the question—for which form of Christianity? Or should we constitute ourselves a sect of excessively primitive Christians and persuade the Churches that they are superfluous? The answer to this must be that the Churches are in any case somewhat firmly established, and more or less set in their ways; and that the wise man does not hammer at stone walls with his hands or waste his energies on impossible tasks. Further than that, the Churches are just as much the products of evolution as rivers and valleys and mountains, or as methods of government, or as our means of transportation. We are prepared to see any of these transformed

* *Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism*, by Newman Smyth. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1908.

and improved:—but we cannot abolish them even if we would. And meanwhile, we can use them.

So we return to the question—for which form of Christianity, or for which particular Church, should we labor; and in the language of which of the creeds should we speak? Here again we find our position unique: we can speak in any language; we can find the spirit in every form. Wherever men are gathered together with some love in their hearts for that which is above and nobler than themselves, we can join them in their worship, and, should the occasion offer, suggest the next step towards a more rational, and at the same time a more spiritual interpretation of the symbols we find them using. Incidentally, we shall learn that before we can serve them, we must gain their confidence: they must discover for themselves that we are not iconoclasts who would tear down, but that we are even more religious than they are, at least as sincere as they are, just as devout as they are, that our respect for their symbols is profound and that our love for the truths which such symbols convey is paramount. Not until they are sure of this will it be possible to help them intellectually, or to place at their disposal the deeper insight into spiritual things which Theosophy has given us.

But with this task before us—of doing what we can to assist the true growth of Christianity in all its forms—it may well be that some one of its forms, owing to its more central position or for other cause, offers better opportunities for our direct co-operation. And according to the Rev. Newman Smyth, that form should be the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, or the established Church of England. Mr. Smyth we believe to be a Congregationalist: so that his opinion in this respect ought to be unbiased and valuable. His reasons in any case are interesting.

He believes in the Church Universal. He believes that the branches of the Church, now separate, can and should unite—or, as he would prefer to express it, can and should make manifest their actual though concealed unity. “Our discussion of the problems of the union of the churches,” he says, “should start from the fact that the Church *is* Catholic; that, as the primary fact, there is one Catholic Church throughout the world. The real problem given us in our day to work out is, not to create that unity, but to manifest it; not to make it anew out of the destruction of our individual inheritance, but to make it manifest as the one Life through all the forms and organs of it. Our problem, in a word, is the visibility of church unity” (p. 139).

He points out that the Modernists within the Church of Rome are discovering a way through the bewilderment of the creeds of Christendom. “These Modernists are learning an answer for us all.

Protestantism may find itself more indebted than we know to those Roman Catholic thinkers and historians for the answer which they have been compelled to discover in order to save the loyalties of their own faith. It is given in their principle of the historical development of the dogmas of the Church. That truth is in all their thoughts; and it keeps them within their Church, while it emancipates them from all bondage to its traditions. Concisely stated, it is the truth that the dogmas of the Church are successive developments of the reflective life of the Church. And they may be fruits fresh every season. Creeds are not to be acknowledged as contracts between believers; they are to be received as the garnered stores of past religious experience for the use of the living mind of the Church. The creeds of Christendom are not mere repetitions, they are necessary growths of the Christian faith. Dogmas are symbols, interpretations, from time to time men's best appreciations of the truth. They are true as they bear witness to the true Christian life in the language of each age. And it is the orthodoxy, not of a single creed, or of a finished formula, but the truth of all Christian creeds which the one Catholic Church rejoices to own. This has been historically, and it must be always, a continuous, yet a changing orthodoxy, because it is a growing confession of the faith which is ever springing up anew from the life of the Christ with men. Take any creed as a closed formula, and such creed would be but as the cerement of faith. Confess any Christian creed as a symbol of the truth, and it becomes an expression of fellowship with the whole thought of the Church as it knows, and follows on to know the Lord" (pp. 169-170).

In the words of Father Tyrrell, "Revelation is to theology what the stars are to astronomy." That is to say, "the stars remain the same through all the ages, while men's conceptions of the stars have changed from age to age." And what is true of revelation, is equally true of all "divine realities." For the aims and interests of the Modernists are many, and they are not inclined to limit their view of growth, merely to biblical interpretation. In the matter of ritual, they "know the need of a more spiritualized worship, and they would purify the religious symbolism of their Church from uses which are really irreligious. They would retain the ritual in which their most intimate experience of religion has found and may continue to find, its reverent expression and an ever-present help; but they would use it as symbolism, and prevent the abuse of it as superstition. . . . It is never by the symbol, altar, or cross, or sainted face—it is only when the symbol is made an idol, that the truth is betrayed" (pp. 185, 187).

Then, again, "some are absorbed in social questions; others have their eyes upon the rights of science; still others are 'deeply concerned with the moral aspirations and mysteries of the human soul.'

Some are occupied with the questions of Biblical criticism, and their weapons are mainly those of all modern historical students. Others again are concerned with the development of dogmas and the relations of faith to the modern mind." And while some appeal broadly to the laity as well as to the clergy, others seek only "to disseminate their ideas among an intellectual *élite* of ecclesiastics and laics, to prepare opinions and to wait for the favorable time to see the reforms bring themselves to pass" (p. 109).

From all of which, and particularly because of their historical principles, it follows, as Mr. Smyth makes clear, that the Roman Catholic Modernists are restoring to Protestants "a key to the solution of their problem of unity amid doctrinal diversities."

For if unity is to come out of the diversity which now exists, the Protestant sects in any case must realize that they form one Church, before an even wider Catholicism can be established. In this direction much already is being achieved: the amendment of Canon XIX, referred to in the July issue of *THE QUARTERLY*, has formally opened the pulpits of the Protestant Episcopal Church to the ministers of other denominations—to Presbyterians, Methodists, and to all other "Christian men." And the same Church, historically and doctrinally, is not so widely separated as are most Protestant bodies from the Church of Rome. Consequently, in Mr. Smyth's opinion, "Episcopacy holds the key to the door through which other churches may be invited to enter into a catholicism large enough to hold them all. . . . The Episcopal Church, by virtue of its tradition and position, has, as no other, I am venturing to say, the opportunity and the call to become the mediating Church among all the churches. How it shall heed this call, in what definite and practical ways it may be guided to meet this opportunity, seems to be the first and immediate question of Protestant reunion. Others must wait for its answer" (pp. 161, 163).

How should it so be guided? It may be that Theosophists, by all these years of Christian propaganda (for the occult tradition is of the very essence of Christianity), have already done much to guide the thought of the western world, including that of the Episcopal Church, in the direction the Church should go. We have upheld the immediate reality of Christ, both as active principle and as living Master. We have maintained, as few if any of the Churches have maintained, the truth of the saying, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." We have insisted that the words of St. John—"That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world"—are literally and not merely apologetically true. We have declared, and have done our best to prove philosophically, that "as many as received Him, to them gave He power to

become the sons of God." In other words, we have stood, among Protestants, as the defenders of Christian Mysticism, which the Protestant Churches, unlike the Roman Catholic, have for the most part failed to value or to understand. In our opinion, it is only because of a growing belief among Churchmen in these mystical and truly Christian tenets, that such a book as Mr. Smyth's could ever have been written; and it will be because of their more vital appreciation, and for no other reason, that the best of Churchmen everywhere will learn to look more and more for points of agreement between themselves and others, rather than for points of difference.

Does this mean that Theosophists have already done their share of the work? It is the belief of the present writer that they have scarcely yet begun it. In years past, they had to use the means and methods of pioneers: their work was rough and crude. There seemed to be no time for tact, even if the circumstances had called for it. We laughed at prejudices; we rode rough-shod over habits of mind and speech; we gave and received blows, carelessly, like half-grown boys. But now we are men—or ought to be. Among other things, our manners should have improved. The need now is not for rough and tumble fighting, but for tact and patience and a tremendous perseverance. It is possible to be brave, and yet to be wise.

Is there any virtue in parading the extent of our differences from others? Do we further the scheme of evolution by labeling ourselves "peculiar"? If it were given to us to assist some spiritual revival in China, should we flaunt before Chinamen our most superior familiarity with the Bible? If we found them to be repelled by the doctrine of Reincarnation, but ready to accept that of the infinite possibilities latent in all men, would it be wise or right to insist that they must swallow either both pearls, or none? Surely by this time we as Theosophists should have learned the meaning of "esotericism." Surely we should have discovered that at a meeting of members and students, or at a meeting advertised as theosophical, it is right and proper to use, within limits, our own terminology, and to expound those views of life and of nature which we regard as distinctively our own; while, on the other hand, at a meeting of Oddfellows or of Baptists or of Positivists, it is best (and certainly more polite) to use so far as we can whatever language we may find current there among them.

In every sense, if we consider ourselves qualified to teach, we should be able so to modulate our voices that we do not frighten or deafen our pupils. To carry them one step further than their previous thought is helpful; but to attempt to flick them into jumping a mile is either silly or insane.

We have been entrusted with great truths. It is right that we

should desire to share those truths with others. But we believe that some have knowledge of still greater truths. Do we find them trying to spill these into us, regardless of our mental and spiritual capacity? We, too, must learn to be as wise as serpents and as harmless as doves. To be all things to all people is simply to remember that not all men have the same powers of digestion, and that it is not our business to nauseate anyone.

Above all things let us avoid the negative attitude. Our work should be constructive; not destructive. If we learn that someone believes firmly in the Immaculate Conception, instead of chasing him with the wholly unimportant fact that we do not (if we do not, and, as students of Theosophy, we should know that this dogma is the symbol of a fundamental truth)—let us realize that on this particular point our friend needs time in which to mature, but that on other points his mind may be looking for light, and that further acquaintance with him may reveal in just what connection we may be of service *to his soul*.

Let us remember finally, even in this matter of the Christian churches, that if we were truly to live the Christian life, in thought and deed, our very presence, without a word uttered, would be an inspiration and a help in the direction of that Catholic unity for which Mr. Smyth so earnestly pleads, and the manifestation of which, on a genuinely Catholic basis, would confer such incalculable benefits upon the world. Our silence, with the right life behind it, would speak more eloquently than many words, not only of Christianity, but of that ancient wisdom, a reminder of which was given us under the name of Theosophy.

E. T. H.

"To humble ourselves, to repent, to stand alert at the rumor of a Divine message, such acts as these lie within our own power; acts whereby we all can please God. And if nothing further become possible to us, then surely, even at such a point, we shall not miss a blessing."

CHRISTINA ROSSETTI.

NATURAL PSYCHICAL AND SPIRITUAL BODIES.

THE shortest of all the older Upanishads is the Mandukya. Yet in some ways it contains fuller and deeper teaching than any other of these wonderful treatises of the Mysteries. For the theme of the Mandukya is the four degrees of consciousness, the Natural, the Psychical, the Spiritual, and the Divine, which make up the whole range of life, both manifested and unmanifested. And, further, to systematize and condense the teaching, and to sum it up in a single word, the Mandukya Upanishad goes on to compare the four degrees of consciousness with the four divisions of the mystical syllable "OM," which is resolved into its elements, A, U, M, thus representing both the One, and its three lower degrees of manifestation.

On this marvelous little treatise, the condensed essence of the Mystery Teaching, a certain sage, Gaudapada by name, has written a poem. This poem is now translated, prefaced by the Mandukya Upanishad itself. Gaudapada, it would seem, belongs to the period immediately after the long life-time of Siddhartha the Compassionate, known to his devotees as Gautama Buddha, who was born at Kapilavastu five-and-twenty centuries ago. That the teachings of the Buddha were still recent, when Gaudapada wrote his poem, is shown by the way he discusses and controverts certain Nihilistic expressions of these teachings, in the latter part of his poem. The date of the work is further fixed in the period immediately after the Buddha, if the tradition of the Brahmans of Southern India be a true one, that Gaudapada is no other than Patanjali, author of the famed Yoga Sutras, and also of a learned work on Grammar. Whether we accept this tradition or no, and for my part I am inclined to believe it, we may say that the two works, the present poem and the Yoga Sutras, do fit wonderfully together, supplementing each other in a marvelous way.

And indeed it is largely the hope and expectation of translating the Yoga Sutras of Patanjali that have led me to the present work; for Patanjali plunges at once into the middle of the most practical psychology, assuming in his readers a knowledge of the spiritual philosophy of ancient India, which few modern readers, perhaps, possess. So that it is largely with the idea of supplying a philosophical and intellectual background for the Yoga Sutras of Patanjali, that I have decided to try to turn Gaudapada's poem into English. Its philosophical quality is excellent; its authority is universally accepted;

and it is by no means such difficult reading as the Yoga Sutras; in fact, there is not very much in Gaudapada's poem that requires a commentary. It was, seemingly, written as a popular work, to make more readily available the summed up wisdom of the Mandukya Upanishad.

Now a word as to the position of this poem, from another point of view. It stands between the Vedic works and the Sutras of Patanjali, in date, in content, and in purpose. The older Vedic works, including the Upanishads, had, as their purpose, a consecrated life, a life permeated with the active spirit of religion, in which every part of life, every thought, word and deed, should be done "as to the Lord." The life built up on this Vedic teaching, and followed by a very large part of the people of ancient India, is hardly to be excelled in the purity of its ideal, its fervor, its value as spiritual discipline, by any like culture in the world; and this searching, stringent, spiritual culture is taken for granted, in all philosophical works, such as the present.

That, therefore, is the background of the present poem: a thorough training in practical religion, covering every detail of life, and filled with the spirit of devotion to the Most High. And after this poem come the Yoga Sutras of Patanjali, the essence of practical transcendental psychology. This helps us to define the position and purpose of the poem itself.

When the whole nature has been thoroughly trained in practical religion, and enkindled with the spirit of devotion, the time is approaching when the higher degrees of consciousness may be practically explored. The first two of these higher degrees have recently been described by Sir Oliver Lodge as "the stratum of dream," and the "stratum of genius." The "strata of dream and genius," thus described, correspond exactly to the degrees of psychical and spiritual consciousness, of the present poem; and it is marvelous how close Sir Oliver Lodge comes, both in thought and in expression, to the ancient Oriental teaching, just as he does, in his view of "the One Life, manifesting itself in the lives"; a phrase which may be claimed either by Sir Oliver or by the authors of the Prashna Upanishad. There are further degrees of consciousness, at least suspected by Sir Oliver Lodge and his colleagues, and clearly defined in the Upanishads, and in poems like the present, which follow the wisdom of the Upanishads. And these, too, must in time be entered.

But before this practical transcendental psychology can be learned, there must come a thorough and searching training of the intellect, just as the moral nature has previously been trained by practical religion. For ancient India never made the mistake of imagining that a sound training of the intellect can precede, or dispense with,

a right moral training. And it is precisely to give this thorough intellectual training, built on the foundation of a consecrated religious life, that the present poem was written. It takes up, and develops, every faculty of the mind and understanding, and brings each faculty into unity with the intuitional and spiritual nature. In this way a quality of spiritual intellect is attained, which can hardly be equalled throughout the world; and the wisdom of India is perhaps most of all distinguished by this, that it adds to a perfectly religious and devoted spirit and an active spiritual will, an intellect, clear, crystalline, powerful, which grasps, and grasps successfully, the most difficult problems of thought. Such an intellect, instead of being a hindrance to spiritual attainment, may be a very powerful help; provided always it is realized that it should rest on a profoundly religious nature, and that it should be the stepping stone to practical experience of the higher degrees of consciousness, "the strata of dream and genius," and the further degrees that lie beyond; that it should stand between the devotion, let us say, of the Bhagavad Gita, and the practical transcendental psychology of such a book as the Yoga Sutras of Patanjali.

Now to turn to the poem itself. Though it is so lucid in form and style that it hardly needs a commentary, yet a very excellent commentary exists, by no less a teacher than the great Shankara himself. From this admirably conceived treatise, which is too voluminous to translate in full here, I may, perhaps, gather a few of the most interesting passages, beginning with what Shankara says, of the Mandukya Upanishad itself.

After a general introduction, Shankara proceeds to pick up difficult or technical points in the Upanishad, or in Gaudapada's poem. Thus the "sevenfold form" of the Natural Body consists of the head, the upper and lower trunk, and the arms and legs. It also refers to such characteristics as the seven plexuses. The "nineteen mouths" are the five powers of perception (what we call the five senses), the five powers of action, the five vital ethers, and the four mental powers: namely, manas, buddhi, chitta and ahankara, which we may translate emotion, intellect, imagination, and egoism. The Psychical Body is similarly formed.

Of the Psychical Consciousness, Shankara says: "The realm of the Psychical Self is dream-consciousness. In waking consciousness, with its several powers of perception, objects are perceived externally, though they are really due only to the play of Manas. Thereby impressions are imprinted on Manas. In this way Manas becomes like a canvas on which pictures are painted. Then, without external instruments, and through the action of Avidya and Kama (entranced desire), a condition similar to that of waking arises."

Of the condition of Dreamless Consciousness, Shankara writes:

"In the Spiritual Consciousness, the sense of separateness ceases. It is a pure, uniform, blissful Consciousness. The Spiritual Self knows both past and future, and is therefore fitly called all-knowing." Shankara then presses home what is said of the Fourth Consciousness, the Divine, and adds: "The Fourth is attained by merging the other three into it, each degree being merged in that which is above it." Thus the Natural Self will be merged in the Psychical Self; this will be merged in the Spiritual Self; and this finally in the Divine Self, in whom all worlds rest.

Shankara has certain quaint images to illustrate the power of Maya and its relation to the Real. A rope is lying on the ground, he says; a man, seeing it indistinctly, believes it to be a snake. So is the world of illusion perceived in the Real. But there is no snake there at all; so it cannot be said to have a beginning, nor can it be said to come to an end. It simply does not exist. So is it with the illusion of a world of pain, separate from the Divine. Again, the world-illusion is like the robber imagined by the belated wayfarer, who sees a post in the twilight. When he sees that it is really a post, and no robber, it cannot be said that the robber has come to an end. There simply was no robber. So also with the mirage, the lake fancied in the salt desert, which, in Sanskrit has the pretty name of "the thirst of the deer." The images of the sun in bubbles, the sparks of the fire, the spider spinning a web from his own entrails, are others of Shankara's similes.

One he uses, which has a special interest, in these days of "hypnotic suggestion;" "A juggler," he tells us, "throws the end of a rope into the sky, and climbing up the rope, disappears with all his trappings. Then his body falls piecemeal, as though cut up by a sword, and he again comes together in the sight of the onlookers, who do not pay heed to the real nature of the illusion. In exactly the same way, the conditions of waking, dream, dreamiessness, are like the rope thrown up by the juggler who appears to climb up the rope. The real cause of the illusion stands there, apart from both the rope and him who climbs up the rope, hid by the glamor he casts, invisible. So the Fourth Consciousness, the Divine, the transcendental reality, stands apart. Therefore those noble ones who seek Liberation pay heed to the Real only, and not to the illusion that is spread before them."

This is a very famous trick, which has delighted and astonished the men of many lands, through many centuries; but only in this treatise of the great Shankara, I think, is its true nature described. There are many more admirable and luminous things in Shankara's commentary, but the limitations of time and space, as he himself would say, preclude my quoting further.

MANDUKYA UPANISHAD.

"Om": This imperishable syllable is all that is. Its expansive expression is: What has been, What is, What shall be. All this is "Om." And whatever else there is, beyond the threefold division of Time, that, also, verily, is "Om." For all this is Brahma, the Eternal; and the Self, Atma, is the Eternal. And this Self stands in four worlds.

In the world of Waking Consciousness, Jagrat, objectively perceiving, of sevenfold form, with nineteen mouths—organs of sense and action—an enjoyer of gross matter, this is the Natural Self, Vaishvanara, the first measure or foot.

In the world of Dream Consciousness, Swapna, subjectively perceiving, of sevenfold form, with nineteen mouths—organs of sense and action—an enjoyer of finer matter, this is the Psychical Self, Taijasa, the second measure or foot.

Where, entered into rest, he desires no desire and beholds no dream, this is Dreamless Consciousness, Sushupti. Dreamless consciousness, unified, collective perception, verily, made of bliss, an enjoyer of bliss, perceiving through the heart, this is the Spiritual Self, Prajna, the third measure or foot. This is the All-lord, this is the all-knower, this is the Inner ruler, this is the womb of all, the forthcoming and indrawing of beings.

Neither subjectively perceiving, nor objectively perceiving, nor perceiving in both ways, neither collective perception, nor perception nor non-perception; unseen, not to be apprehended, not to be grasped, without sign of separation, unimaginable, unindicable, the essence of the consciousness of the Self, in which the manifest world ceases, full of peace, benign, secondless, this is held to be the Fourth Consciousness, this is the Self, Atma, this is the goal of wisdom.

This Self, Atma, corresponds according to syllables with the "Om" according to its measures. The measures are as the feet, and the feet are as the measures: A, U and M, to wit.

The Natural Self in Waking Consciousness, is the A, the first measure, so called from being the first, and from acquiring. He passes beyond all desires and becomes first, who thus knows.

The Psychical Self, in Dream Consciousness, is the U, the second measure, so called from its up-raising and uniting. He is upraised to the highest knowledge, and becomes united, nor in his family do knowers of the Eternal fail, who thus knows.

The Spiritual Self in Dreamless Consciousness, is the M, the third measure, so called because it measures all, or because all merges in it. He measures all, and in him all merges, who thus knows.

Without measure is the Fourth, not to be apprehended, wherein manifestation comes to rest, the benign, secondless. Thus the "Om" is as the Self, Atma. Through the Self, he enters the Self, who thus knows, who thus knows.

GAUDAPADA'S POEM ON THE MANDUKYA UPANISHAD.

I.

Objectively perceiving, wide-extending is the Natural Self; subjectively perceiving is the Psychical Self; collectively perceiving is the Spiritual Self; the One Self, verily, is thus manifested as three.

The Natural Self has its center in the right eye, and the mouth; the Psychical Self is centered in the mental and emotional nature; in the pure ether and in the heart dwells the Spiritual Self; thus it dwells in its vesture threefold.

The Natural Self is the enjoyer of gross matter; the Psychical Self is the enjoyer of finer matter; the Spiritual Self is the enjoyer of bliss. Learn thus the threefold division of feasts.

The gross gratifies the Natural Self; the finer gratifies the Psychical Self; but bliss delights the Spiritual Self. Know thus the threefold order of delights.

He who knows both what is enjoyed in the three dwellings of the Self, and also who is the enjoyer, he, indeed, even though enjoying, shall not be stained. (5)

The forth-coming of all beings from what has been before is certain; the One Life, the Spirit, causes each fragment of consciousness to be born.

Some who ponder on manifestation think that all comes forth by evolution; by others manifestation is deemed to be of the nature of dream or glamor.

Some think of manifestation that it is manifested through the mere will of the Lord. Those who believe in Time, think the evolution of beings comes through Time alone.

Some think all things were manifested for enjoyment; others that all was made for sport. But the universe is the very being of God; and what desire could there be in Him, who has attained all desires?

Master of the surcease of all pain, the Lord who passes not away, secondless, the God of all beings,—this is the Fourth degree of consciousness, the Divine. (10)

The bonds of cause and what is caused rule the Natural and Psychical Selves. The Spiritual Self is bound by cause; but these two rule not in the Fourth degree of consciousness, the Divine.

The Spiritual Self perceives not beings divided into Self and Others, nor divided into the real and the inverted image of reality. The Fourth degree of consciousness, the Divine, forever beholds the All.

The Spiritual Self and the Divine Self have this in common, that neither perceives duality. The seed of the illusion of separateness dwells in the Spiritual Self, but no longer exists in the Divine.

Dream-forms and the illusion of separateness condition both the Natural and the Psychical Selves; the Spiritual Self has the seed of separateness without the forms of dream; but those who are established in the Fourth degree of consciousness, the Divine, perceive neither the illusion of separateness nor the forms of dream.

Through the forms of dream, things are seen as other than they are; through the illusion of separateness, one knows not the Real. When these two inversions of perception are overcome, then one enters the Fourth degree of consciousness, the Divine. (15)

When the individual Life is awakened from the dream of beginningless world-glamor, then the unborn, undeluded, undreaming, secondless Divine is known.

If the manifest world had real being, it should pass away in time. But this duality is sheer illusion; transcendental being is one and secondless.

If the world were built up by anyone, that building should pass away in time. This expression of duality lasts only while instruction lasts; when the truth is known, duality comes to an end.

The Natural Self and the letter A have this in common, that they stand at the beginning; they have also in common the power of acquiring.

The Psychical Self and the letter U have in common the power of up-raising; they are also brought together by having the power of uniting. (20)

The Spiritual Self is connected with the letter M through the power of measuring; through the power of merging, it is also united with it.

He who knows certainly that which is the quality in common, in the three dwellings of the Self, he is to be honored of all beings; he is to be praised as a perfect seer.

The letter A leads to the Natural Self; the letter U leads to the Psychical Self; the letter M again to the Spiritual Self; there is no going in that which is without measure.

The "Om" should be known as according with the four realms of consciousness; for without doubt these four realms correspond to the measures of "Om." When one has understood the "Om" as

according with the realms of consciousness, thought need go no further.

Let him bring his consciousness to union in the sacred syllable "OM"; for the "OM" is the fearless Eternal. He who is ever united in the "OM" sees no fear anywhere. (25)

The "OM" is the manifest Eternal, and the unmanifest Eternal also. The "OM" has nought before it, nought within it, nought without it, it passes not away.

For the "OM" is the beginning of all things, it is likewise the middle and the end. Knowing thus the "OM," he straightway enters that Supreme.

Let him know the "OM" as the Master, dwelling in the heart of every being. Understanding the "OM" as the all-embracing, the wise man sorrows no more.

By whom the "OM," the measureless, the immeasurable, the surcease of duality, the benign, is rightly known, he indeed, and no other, is the silent seer.

II.

The wise have declared that all forms seen in dream are unsubstantial; because they are subjective, and not formed of gross matter.

One does not actually go to the places he beholds in dream, for the time is too short; and on awaking, he does not find himself in the place he was dreaming of.

The Scripture also declares that chariots and horses seen in dream are unreal, as logic has shown. Therefore it is proven that things seen in dreams are unsubstantial.

It is taught that all things separate from the Self, though seen in waking life, are as unreal as things seen in dream. They are distinguished from these only because dreams are subjective, and of finer stuff.

The sages have declared that things seen in dream and waking are equally unreal, because both are separate from the Self, and nought but the Self is real. (5)

That which is nothing in the beginning, and nothing at the end, is likewise nothing in the middle. Separate things are like the mirage, though they are viewed as real, not as mirage.

The efficiency of these things ceases in dream; therefore, as they have both beginning and end, they are declared to be unreal.

That dream-scenes appear in unprecedented forms, is due only to the character of him who is in the dream-condition; just as the unprecedented scenes of the heaven-world arise from the character of those in the heaven-world. He who goes there, views these things

and understands them, just as one well-taught here understands what he views.

In the dream-condition, also, that which is perceived subjectively is recognised as unreal, but that which appears objectively is held to be real; yet both are equally illusory.

So in the waking condition, what is perceived subjectively is recognised as unreal, but what is grasped objectively is held to be real; yet it is fitting to hold both equally illusory. (10)

If in both these conditions, we admit the illusory nature of all things seen as separate, who is it that thinks them separate? Who is the creator of these forms?

The Self, Atma, of Himself makes Himself appear in these forms, as a God, by his magical power of glamor. It is He who thinks these forms separate from Himself. This is the certain teaching of the Vedanta.

He as Lord moulds the various forms that are ranged in subjective consciousness; it is He also who builds up the forms that are set in external consciousness.

The forms that exist only in the time that we are conscious of them in thought, and the forms that appear externally at two different times, are all equally built up by imagination; they are of different degrees, but not otherwise different.

Subjective forms which are not outwardly manifested, and things which are clearly seen as external, are all alike built by the imagination; the only difference between them is the difference of the powers which perceive them. (15)

The Self, Atma, first forms the Individual Life, Jiva; thereafter the Self shapes beings of varied form, both those which are external, and those which are in self-consciousness. According to the inherent knowledge of the Individual Life, so is its memory.

As the rope, which cannot be perceived distinctly in the dark, is changed by imagination into various forms, such as a serpent, or a streak of water, so is the Self, Atma, changed by imagination into various forms.

As the imagined form vanishes when the rope is distinctly seen, and it is perceived that there is the rope, and nothing else, so is the clear perception of the Self, Atma.

The Self is imagined to take the forms of the life-breaths and numberless other forms; this is the magical glamor of the God, whereby Himself is concealed from view.

Those who believe in the Life see Him as Life; those who believe in the elements see Him as the elements; those who believe in the Nature-powers see Him as the Nature-powers; those who believe in the forms of matter, see Him as the forms of matter. (20)

Those who see the four degrees of consciousness, perceive Him as the four stages of consciousness; those who believe in objects, see Him as objects; those who believe in worlds, see Him as worlds; those who believe in Gods, see Him as the Gods.

Those who believe in the Scriptures, the Vedas, see Him in the Scriptures; those who believe in sacrifices, see Him in sacrifices; those who think of the consciousness which enjoys, see Him as the enjoying consciousness; those who think of what is enjoyed, see Him as what is enjoyed.

Those whose thought is set on the subtle, see Him as the subtle; those whose thoughts are set on the gross, see Him as the gross; those who think of the formed, see Him in the formed; those who think of the formless, see Him in the formless.

Those who think of Time, see Him as Time; those who think of space, see Him in space; those who are set on words, think of Him as words; those who dwell on the worlds, think of Him as the worlds.

Those who dwell on emotion, think of Him as emotion; those who dwell on pure thought, think of Him as pure thought; those who dwell in imagination, think of Him as imagination; those who dwell in law, think of Him as Law; those who disregard law, think of Him as above law. (25)

Some see Him as the five-and-twenty powers, others as the six-and-twenty; others as one-and-thirty; yet others as innumerable.

Those who think of the realms of life, declare Him to be the regions of life; those who think of the stages of development, see Him as the stages of development; those who think of difference of sex, think of Him as feminine, masculine, neuter; others think of Him as the Higher and the Lower.

Those who believe in evolution, think of Him as evolution; those who believe in involution, think of Him as involution; those who believe the world is stationary, think of Him as stationary. Thus all ever perceive Him, each after his own thought.

In whatever form He may appear to anyone, that form each beholds; He protects him, becoming that form; and he who thinks on Him under that form, enters into Him.

He, who is not divided, appears divided through these various forms; he who knows this truly, may without fear imagine Him in any form. (30)

As a dream or an illusion of glamor, or as fairy-city seen in the air, such is all this world declared to be, by the seers, in the Vedanta teachings.

There is no coming to an end, there is no manifestation, there is none bound, there is none seeking to attain, there is none seeking freedom, there is none freed, this is the transcendental, the final truth.

By Him, though ever One, this is imagined in unreal forms; the forms are all produced by the One; therefore Oneness is the blessed state.

These varied forms are not of the same nature as the Self, nor are they of independent nature; they have no being either separate from the Self, or not separate from the Self; thus have the knowers of the Real perceived.

By those from whom passion and fear and wrath are gone, the Masters of silence, who have crossed to the farther shore of the Vedas, is this Unchanging One beheld, in whom the worlds come to surcease, who is secondless. (35)

Therefore, knowing Him thus, let him fix his memory on the Secondless One; gaining the Secondless One, let him walk the world as though it were inert.

Let him who has conquered himself be above praise, seeking no adoration, ceasing from offerings to spirits; though amid the mutable, yet dwelling in the immutable; meeting the events of life as they come.

Seeing the reality beneath self-consciousness, and seeing also the reality beneath external things, let him become the reality, finding his pleasure-ground therein, never falling below the Real.

CHARLES JOHNSTON.

(To be concluded.)

"You have three great foes, Hurry, Flurry, Worry. Hurry breeds slackness; it destroys interior rest. Flurry breeds uncertainty; it destroys recollection. Worry breeds doubt, fear and the dark broods which are destructive of detachment. These three foes must be put aside before any real or deep degree of Silence can be felt. That Silence is the mother of all spiritual accomplishment. These three foes stand between you and the Will of the Master. What shall you do?"

BOOK OF ITEMS.

AN INDIAN LEGEND.

ONCE upon a time, in the long, long ago, a group of red men, not more than two-score in number, were gathered in council in the crevice of a great mountain. They were a mean company, thin, ill-kept and dejected, and upon each countenance was branded the sure sign of cowardice—a hunted and despairing look. The matter under consideration was to them a most vital one; in fact, it was a matter of the life or death of their tribe. While they thus sat in council an old man of their number recited the history of the tribe.

In the years gone by there had come upon them strange and disastrous reverses. From being a great and mighty nation of warriors and hunters they had dwindled in strength and numbers until this mere handful of starved men with a few women and children, in a like condition, were all that were left. First had come their enemies, like a hateful whirlwind, who conquered them in battle and took away their slaves and their goods. Then the hot winds blasted their corn and drove the game from their lands, and this was followed by a dreadful disease which felled their brothers as the wind snaps the dry wands of the swamp-cane.

In vain had they called upon their Tribal Spirit. The ghost of the great warrior who had founded their nation no longer poured his strength into the men nor stamped his beauty upon the brows of their children. In the song-history of the tribe this Spirit had come among them three times at certain periods measured by the moon. Once he came as a giant deer when the herds were almost extinct and a new thrill of life shot through the tough-meated herds, and the land became filled with fat, healthy creatures. Again he came as a great sturgeon, and the nearly deserted river was filled with leaping, glistening fishes. The third time he had come as a tall stalk of corn and the harvests became fuller, so that the little ears, which had been gathered with so much care, were left for the birds' feasting and a new note of joy swelled throughout the land. Thus, with every coming of the Tribal Spirit, came also a great benefit, and now, the moon gave the signs that the spirit was due to return again to them. All this, and more, the old man told and then he spoke of the new fear that had fastened upon them.

For some days there had come among them a giant bear who seized and carried off one of their number at each appearance. This day a man, another day a woman and still another a child. What could be done to defend the tribe against the visits of the great bear? They were weak of arm, too weak to fight the marauder. Their

weapons were gone—lost and broken, and they could not fight the bear. They were hemmed in between two fears, the hostile tribes of the valleys and the great bear of the mountain. To leave their present refuge would insure them death at the hands of their enemies; to stay meant that they would all become food for the bear!

Even as the old man spoke the great bear came upon them. A loud wail of lamentation arose from their throats as the huge animal seized a young man and began to drag him away. The horror that showed in the victim's eyes quickly changed to a look of desperation. He valiantly grasped a large, sharp stone and with a fierce cry, the old tribal war-cry so long dead on the lips of his fathers, he fell upon the bear and beat its head with the stone. The bear fought with all the power of its strength, but it seemed as though all the craft and all the might had returned to the tribe and centred in the young brave. Every stroke of the stone fell with a renewed violence upon the shaggy head, until finally the thick skull was cloven and the bear lay dead at the feet of the young man.

Then there arose from the body of the dead bear the form of a mighty warrior. First it came as a cloud rift with streaks of sunlight. Then it gathered as a tall column enclosing a bright flame. And then it took form and a shout of joy arose, for they recognized the great Tribal Spirit that was to come!

Then the spirit spoke to them, saying: "My children, I have been always with you, but you knew me not. In the hunt I have lived in your eyes and ears, but you neither saw nor heard me. When your foes assailed you I dwelt in your heads and arms, but the doors of your hearts were closed to me, and how in battle could you expect success unless you knew me? Thus, lacking me you lacked the finest quality of the heart, and who among you, needing this quality, is fitted to live? Thrice I returned to you with gifts, but you remembered me not. At last I come to you with the greatest gift of all. It is myself. Coming as a bear to destroy you I gave to the young man the power to slay the slayer, for the door of his heart opened unto me at the supreme moment and I entered therein. Henceforth know me in your hearts—for the finest quality of the heart is—courage." Thus saying the Tribal Spirit melted away as a form but entered as a quality into their hearts, and this quality shone in their eyes, changed to music the noise of their tongues and ran like a living fire in their veins. So they won back their lands and became again a great tribe! And in the crevice in the mountains, where they sat that day in council, they raised a totem, a pole graven with the picture of a great bear, a sharp stone and a young man; and all other tribes respected this totem, for it was raised to "the finest quality of the heart"—the *courage* of the spirit of man.

FRANK A. BRUCE.

THE ELDER BROTHERS.

AT the time of the publication of Mr. Sinnett's *Occult World* in 1883, attention was once more forcibly directed to the existence of a body of men who were possessed of supernatural knowledge. Among them were numbered those who had given to Mr. Sinnett the information which he embodied in the *Occult World* and *Esoteric Buddhism*, and who had originated the Theosophical Movement, within which the Theosophical Society was founded by Madame Blavatsky, under the direction of these Elder Brethren. To the Eastern World the existence of such a body of men was and is familiar. In all the sacred writings of the East, the mention of the Rishis, Sages, Mahatmas, Gurus—call them by what name you will—is an integral part. It is a part of the everyday life of Oriental nations and in this particular Mr. Sinnett's books occasioned no surprise. In another direction there was surprise—namely, that these Great Souls should condescend to manifest to the despised "Western Outcasts" the existence of their carefully guarded powers and secrets.

So guarded were they (in the higher interests of mankind), that those who had best reason to know the truth, derided Madame Blavatsky, Mr. Sinnett and his informants, on the ground that such spiritual beings would never have condescended to exercise these powers for such trivial ends. But though ridicule was cast from every direction—on the one hand by those who knew of the existence of the Elder Brethren, but wished *jealously* to guard the fact as a profound secret peculiar to their own religious pride: and on the other, by those whose eyes and hearts were closed by a dense material life—there were many to whom the news of the existence of such beings came as a trumpet-call or as the assurance they wanted and the crown of logical thought. It was as if Moses had once more held up the brazen serpent of eternity to the plague-stricken wanderers in the desert of life.

What, then, are the Elder Brethren? Literally, they are those who have been human beings—men like ourselves—who have trodden the path of purification and discipline; who by faith and patience have been made strong and in the strength of their love for others have attained to Wisdom and Liberation; those who in their Wisdom and loving Compassion—have made their sacrifice at every stage of the road. The course of evolution is the drama of the Soul, and the Elder Brethren are the leaders of that stage of the world in which men and women are the actors. In that drama of the Soul we all

play our parts; parts in which we are gradually gaining our experience—the aim being to represent the Soul and its action in the most fitting manner; and thus there are all degrees of wisdom and power from the mere tyro up to the veteran, from the human neophyte to the divine Initiate into the mysteries of life and being.

The Elder Brethren are those who have progressed in the conscious evolution of the Soul, attaining to Wisdom and realizing in themselves that to which they attain. Thus elevating themselves they draw all others up towards them and so guard the destiny of the human race. They watch over their younger brethren, preserve the knowledge gained through æons of trial and experience and lead and educate all who will dare, towards the great truths concerning the destiny of the Soul. Units themselves, in a unity of purpose (viz: in the manifestation of the Soul) they form one body—a collective, organized body of human and divine Wisdom. They are the ministers of Nature's laws, and are as the Messengers and Angels of God.

This collective, highly organized body is known as the Great Lodge, and it includes all others of whatever degree and operation, working under the law of Unity, Love and Compassion.

It may be and is objected that, if such Great Souls exist, why do they not come forward and demonstrate their existence and work? The reply is that they do so; but as invariably are despised and rejected of men and derided as impostors. Still, they come forward when the cyclic time is right and when the need for their action is present. The need of men calls them to raise the standard of virtue and to arouse again in those who have forgotten the sense of the existence and import of the Soul.

For the most part, all over the world, a materialistic civilization had arisen which denied the existence of the nature and life of the Soul. Hence there had been reaction both towards illogical dogmatism and away from it; thus the investigation of such subjects as the life of the Soul was derided and no one believed in the possibility of such powers as the Elder Brethren possess. But the needs of the people called them forth and in the cyclic time the Theosophical Movement was again put forward. If we review the history of the last thirty-five years we shall see in literature, in science and in religion the influence which that Movement has had in the West. We see how the work of Madame Blavatsky and others led to the investigation of the psychic powers latent in man, to the unfolding of the finer forces in nature and man; to the revival of the religious forces; and, distorted though these activities are still, to the unfolding of a greater emphasis upon the life of the Soul.

The Elder Brethren do come forth from their seclusion, some being rulers of men, some teachers, a few great philosophers, while

others remain entirely unknown save to the most advanced in the Lodge. But all work for humanity in their own degree and place; all work for the Soul on planes of consciousness where their labour is as necessary for the real life of humanity as is that of the humblest tiller of the soil of the earth.

They are the "bearers of the Flame of Truth" across the ages. They investigate all things and beings; they know what Man is in his inner nature and they know his destiny, guiding that destiny under the Great Law. They have mastered the mysteries of sound and colour and of the forces which bind together the material objects of our knowledge; they know what lies behind the Screen of Nature; they know and watch the cycles of time and the rise and fall of the nations, and stand securely upon the pinnacle of Soul.

In those cycles of time and among those nations these Elder Brethren, these Masters of Wisdom, have been called Initiates, Adepts, Hierophants, Prophets, Wise Men and many other names. The older mysteries and the oldest books are continually referring to them. They have always existed and they exist to-day. They exist as a necessity of evolution, for they are the culmination throughout the ages of the continual cultivation and growth of the immortal soul. They represent the Soul in its flower. Also they have with them their younger brethren, their companions and their agents in the world. In the "undying East," they move and are known among men where the conditions of life permit them to be known. Now and again their agents appear among Western nations where the names of St. Germain, Paracelsus, St. Martin, H. P. Blavatsky and others are held in derision save by those who know. Of them were Solon, Plato, Jamblichus, Plotinus, Behmen and many a noble name. The mystical movements in the churches, the neo-platonists, with the mystical orders of knighthood, carry us back to the Grecian philosophers and through these and other Theosophical Movements beyond the Avatar of Jesus, the Christ, to that of the Buddha; and so on to more remote ages which we cannot scan but where the work of the great Lodge was yet more manifest because of the belief of mankind.

A recent writer in the THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY for January, 1907, has said:

"We are taught that once every hundred years the Lodge renews its periodical effort to impress these truths upon the mind of man. Agents of the Lodge thoroughly acquainted with the philosophy come forward to teach whatever modification of it is best suited to the times, and to us it would be astonishing if history did not show these traces, instead of its being remarkable to find them, and necessary to show their connection, one with the other. . . . It must not be supposed that these references to the activities of the Lodge, and the ability to trace certain similarities

to Theosophy in different centuries, imply the belief that the efforts of the Lodge always take the form of teaching a philosophy in the world like Theosophy. Indeed we know that this is not the case. We know that at the end of the eighteenth century, they tried to use the Masonic Fraternity and to imbue it with such elevated and spiritual elements as would make it a power for good . . . but for the present, all we need to do is to point out that this effort which the Lodge makes has a character which is determined by time and circumstance, and that many of the Movements in previous centuries may be unrecognizable as such, so far as any similarity to Theosophy is concerned."

Some authors of Movements which have a close similarity to our own eastern teaching and some followers equally imbued with the same, who have taken up the various cyclic movements in this direction, have been given as: The Cathari or Albigenses, in the twelfth century; Peter Waldo of Lyons (1173-1174) began his mission and founded a school or order, The Poor Men of Lyons; Nicolas of Basle was another, and John Tauler; Michael de Molinos, whose spritual writings were first published in 1675. The heretic, John Wyclif, and the martyr, John Huss, show marked traces in their writings of the influence of the movement in the twelfth century. Still other followers and mystics are Suso, John van Ruysbroek, Henry de Kalcar, Gerard Groot, Thomas a Kempis. St. John of the Cross and Saint Theresa were leaders of another such mystical movement. Of greater names, Adepts and Initiates, Madame Blavatsky has written of Orpheus, Pythagoras, Plato, Confucius, Buddha, Jesus, Apolonius of Tyana, Ammonius Saccas, Abraham, Peter, Paul, Simon, and St. John of the Apocalypse. In the century previous to our own just closed, we have Louis Claude de St. Martin, the "unknown philosopher," with the initiators of Masonry, St. Germain and Cagliostro.

They do their work and they do not ask ordinary men and women for their belief—it is not necessary for the work of the Elder Brethren. As a mere detail of work in the world of men, we ourselves do not ask our helpers to show their credentials at every stage. And the Elder Brethren have not put forward any claims. Some of us, who believe in their existence, have put forward claims but not under their authority or at their request.

Thus the existence of the Elder Brethren is a fact to a very large number of men. It is as much a fact as that the sun's rays shine on the earth and, to them, an equally beneficent fact. Those who have undergone the necessary training can recognize the fact in much the same way that an expert in art can recognize the picture of a given Master among painters or as a chemist recognizes a chemical product, because he has the necessary training and experience to do so. In the same way those who have undergone the experience and training may recognize the light of the Soul in those who have trodden the path of purification

and discipline before them. That is—as a rule—the only direct proof. The Elder Brethren are those who in all degrees of knowledge have mastered the wisdom of the Soul. Therefore only those who have similar knowledge can recognize its possession by another. And the old reply can be made to those who deride: Seek and ye shall find: do the work and ye shall know of the doctrine: live the life of the Soul and ye shall recognize your companions and leaders. For so the law always ran and shall run.

The Elder Brethren stand to humanity as its leaders and protectors. They form its crown and flower; they protect its further promise. They are a logical necessity of Evolution; still more are they evidence of the possibility of escape from the toils of this mortal life, into wider and ever widening forms of life. They stand there ready to show us the road to the true immortal life where our eyes shall no longer be blinded and where life is no longer pain but a song of joy; where the restless fever of this life as we know it, is exchanged for a wider and more intense activity—an activity which forms a peace beyond all our present understanding, because it is that of the Divine Soul.

This is the promise of immortality and to this promise the Elder Brethren stand forever as witnesses.

ARCHIBALD KEIGHTLEY.

It may well be that there are mighty spiritual beings in existence, as much in advance of us, in the present state of development, as we are of the least and lowliest of the "beasts that perish" and it may well be that these lowest personalities play a vital part, undreamed of and unimaginable by us, in the direction of the affairs of the Universe. But they do. So (we may rest assured), as children of Nature; and the laws that they administer and obey are to the full as natural as those under which we live.—FROM THE CREED OF CHRIST.

THE RELIGION OF THE WILL.*

THE WILL IN THE SOUL.

I. MIND.

UP to this point, we have dealt chiefly with the bodily life of man, that part of his life which, to a certain degree, he shares with the animals. We have spoken of the Search for Food, through which divine Hunger, most creative and beneficent of the terrestrial powers, has raised up form after form, in a continually advancing scale. We have seen that, impelled by the search for food, any species would, if unopposed, cover the whole earth, and thus conquer space. And we have further studied the second great primal power, that of Race Continuity, whether sexless or later developed into sex; and we have seen that, impelled by this power, any species will tend to perpetuate itself through the ages, and thus conquer time. So much man has in common with the animals.

But even within the limits of these two animal activities, we found that certain marked differences distinguish man from the animals. Whereas, in the search for food, the animals eat to live, man, to a large degree, lives to eat. That is, the animal, such as a cow, eats grass tranquilly day after day, with perfect toleration of its monotonous diet. But man, who has acquired the perfectly new faculty of eating for eating's sake, is for ever seeking new and strange foods, many of which radically disagree with him. If we include potables among foods, man is also disposed to drink things that, far from building up tissue and strengthening him, in reality injure him, and produce temporary or permanent morbid conditions. If we saw a cow which persisted in eating some of the poisonous mushrooms, in spite of spasms, or just for the sake of the spasms, we should hold it to be a pretty worthless kind of cow. Yet the cow's owner is perpetually doing just that sort of thing. What the cow thinks of him, we know not. But one has occasionally seen a faithful dog piloting a drunken master homeward.

When we came to sex, we found very striking differences of the same sort distinguishing animal man from the natural animals. In these, we found a pairing time, for a brief period every year. We found fertile union, followed by the birth of offspring; the whole process being purely for the continuance of the race. And we further found that race continuance was a far more venerable institution than sex union; that mutual aid for the care of the young had existed for ages before sex

* Copyright, 1908, by Charles Johnston.

union came into being, and still exists without sex union in many realms of animal life. But the distinctive thing about man, and we must be candid in our statement of it, however little it is to our credit, we found to be the fact that man has learned to pervert sex from its primary purpose of race continuance, to the secondary purpose of self-indulgence, which bears as little relation to its real purpose as the drinking of absinthe does, to the satisfaction of natural thirst. More than that, we saw that, while there is a pairing time for all animals in nature, outside of which they are practically sexless, there is no such limitation for man, who is possessed by the sense of sex all the year round, and who has found many ways to defeat nature, to the ends of self-indulgence. We recapitulate these facts here, not only because of their great moral importance, but even more for their scientific value, as they point the way to certain most important laws, to which we shall presently draw attention.

Thirdly, we found that, as compared with the natural animals, man has one marvelous faculty: the creative will, in virtue of which he has superposed on the natural world of plants and animals a secondary, non-natural world of plants and animals, which have entirely new characteristics, and many of which nature has never produced, and could never produce.

In these three ways, man has asserted his free will; his power to violate and to transcend the normal laws of nature. Even in his sin and shame he has shown that he possesses a certain divinity. It is in this direction that our further investigations will lead. We shall try to discover the means whereby man thus violates and transcends nature; the laws under which this is possible; and the realms in which these laws are operative. This will bring us to the consideration of The Will in the Soul.

Exactly what we mean by Soul, will presently become apparent. Let us anticipate fuller definition, by saying that we use it in something the same way as St. Paul, as the middle term, in the trinity of Body, Soul, and Spirit. Perhaps it would be wiser to use the Greek word, Psyche, but that might seem pedantic; and at the risk of some slight initial confusion, we shall use the good old English word, Soul.

Naturalists and philosophers have sought to draw a line of demarcation between man and the animals, by saying that man is the only creature that builds fires and cooks his food, or that man is the only creature that wears clothes, and so on. Alfred Russel Wallace, in one of his early essays, made the remarkable point, that man is the only creature which produces and perpetuates characteristics unfavorable in the struggle for existence, and that, therefore, some new factor must enter into the making of man.

I am going to try to draw an entirely new line of demarcation

between man and the animals; the principle of distinction being that man can not only perceive mind-images, as actual, visible objects, but that he can further bring his creative will to bear on them, with marvelous results. I believe the real difference between man and the animals, is, that man has his consciousness on a different plane, a higher plane, and that this plane is, primarily, the plane of mind-images. Let me try to make my meaning perfectly clear.

You are looking at this printed page. Shut your eyes for a moment, and think of the page you have just been looking at. You can see it once more, though indistinctly, in your mind. That picture of the page is what I mean by a mind-image. Think of a landscape you have loved; think of the face of some friend of years ago; think of the dark, thundering surges of the tumultuous sea. In each case, you call up the mind-image; and it lies for a moment in full view of your consciousness, just as a picture is cast on the screen by a magic lantern. We have mind-images for each of the senses; or rather, mind-images may repeat the impressions of each or all of the senses. For example, a musician with a good musical memory can call up the melody and harmony, note by note and chord by chord, of a long piece of music. If he has also the skill of the fingers, he can then turn the mind-images back into audible sounds, on the piano or organ. So one with a good picture-memory can call up, with perfect accuracy of detail, any scene or face he has carefully watched; and, if he also has skill of hand, he can further put that scene down on paper, with a brush and colors, and make it almost live and breathe. The Japanese artists of the better sort paint almost wholly from mind-images. Hence the perfect grace, life and vividness of their pictures of birds and flowers. There are mind-images of many kinds; but, for convenience sake, I shall speak chiefly of the images of things seen.

First of all, as to the location of these mind-images; where are they? There is a school of psychology, which holds that they are in the substance of the brain. It should rather be called a school of mythology; for the supposition that they are in the brain is pure myth-making. No one has ever seen them there, and I am perfectly certain that no one ever will. But seriously, the supposition that the mind-images are in the brain, leads to an endless chain of difficulties. If the images are in the brain, are they all in one part of the brain, or are they distributed all through its substance? When we call up mind-images, they all seem to us to be in nearly the same place; in a field, comparable, if you will, to the field of a telescope, and directly before the conscious perceiver in the mind. But if the mind images are in the brain, where is the conscious perceiver, before whom they appear? Is the consciousness of "I, the perceiver," at one point in the brain? or is it distributed through the whole substance of the brain? If the consciousness is distributed

throughout the brain, how is it that we have always the same sense of the perceiver, in the same place, and with the mind images immediately before it? If it be, on the contrary, all at one point in the brain, what is that point? And how are the infinitely varied mind-images brought directly before it, every time we call anything to mind?

The truth is, that this brain-psychology is pure myth-making. No one has ever seen mind-images in the substance of the brain, or anything remotely resembling them. What we really do know, is that we are conscious of a perceiving power, or rather of a perceiving self, and that before this self mind-images can be brought, by an act of will-power, and viewed as pictures are viewed on a lantern-screen. That much we do know. Anything more is sheer fancy and make-believe. Nor has this brain-psychology even the merit of novelty. It is at least as old as Macbeth, who said:

“ . . . The times have been,

“That, when the brains were out, the man would die.”

But good Macbeth found his psychology shattered on the rock of psychical research; and just the same will happen to the brain-psychologists of our time. For psychical research will show, has indeed shown already, that the consciousness may be exercised in its fullness, with powers of perception and volition, where the brain is not at all; where it is evidently lodged in one of the finer bodies, the astral body or the psychical body, which are forcing themselves upon our science, just as the ghost of Banquo forced itself upon the unwilling Macbeth.

But this is not a treatise on psychical science, so this side of the matter must not tempt us farther. For our purpose, it is quite enough to stick to the facts which anybody can observe, at a moment's notice: that we have a perceiving self; and that the mind-images come up before this perceiving self, either by chance, as it would seem, or by a conscious effort of will; just as these pages may open in my hand by chance, or I may open them, by an act of will, at the particular page I wish to read.

It is precisely the region of these mind-images which we shall now try to explore. And to begin with, let us carefully note the fact, for hard fact it is, that we can call up any mind-image at will, say, a house, or a horse, or a tree, or a cloud; and, what is even more remarkable, we can hold these mind-images in the field of view, and make them do things. We can make the horse rear and stand on his hindlegs; we can even make him stand on his head, or take wings, and fly. We can make the house anything from a cottage to a castle, from a log-cabin to a sky-scraper; and we can make it grow as we watch; we can, indeed, build castles in the air. As for the tree, we can make it a palm, or an oak, or an orange-tree; and if the latter, we can make it bloom, and bear ripe fruit, within a moment; indeed, we can make it emulate the marvelous tree of the

Apocalypse, which bare twelve manner of fruit every year; but we, in our minds, can perform the year's miracle in a moment. Now without wishing to nag the brain-psychologists, I should like to ask, purely from love of knowledge, what they think goes on, when we do wondrous works like this, in our minds? What a whirl the brain-stuff must be in. It makes one's head ache, even to think of it. What takes place in the brain, when I recall, let us say, the Sanskrit word for skull, *kapala*, akin to the Greek *kephale*? Have I a Sanskrit dictionary in my brain? And if so, whereabouts? And a Shakespeare glossary, and ever so many more? I should like to see even the smallest trace of any one of them, in a solar microscope, or by any other method.

But if we take the matter naturally, and as we actually know it, and speak of what we can verify, the mind-images, then the thing becomes perfectly simple. I have the perceiving consciousness, before which I can call up mind-images, at will; or, when my will is relaxed, they come up of themselves; but there they are, in the field of the mind, and I can take them there, and move them about, and build them up one on another, and pull them to pieces, handling them without hands, and moulding them to my will. But the brain-psychologists deny the will, as a real thing? Well, what is the value of a system, which is directly contrary to all human experience? It is just like denying that I can lift the book off the table, whereas I know perfectly well that I can lift it or leave it, just as I will. The proof of it is the doing of it; and the will in action vindicates itself, in spite of all the psychologists who may have befuddled their heads, and who would fain render us the like service. One man of genius among the psychologists has expressed the truth: the brain has a transmissive power; it transmits the impulses of the Life, which is beyond the brain.

But let me get back from brain-mythology to the safe ground of fact. The mind-images come up before the field of my consciousness. I can call them up, and send them away again, calling up others, to take their place. This is, of course, memory; and memory is always more or less under the control of the will. But the clearness of memory depends on something else, that has gone before. It depends on clearness of impression, and this on clearness of observation, and this again on attention. If we are reading a sentence, we can either fix the mind on it, or let the mind pass over it floatingly, vaguely. In the former case, we can easily remember it; in the latter, we shall hardly remember it at all. And to do the one or the other, lies wholly within our wills. For example, I begin to read a page. Then I overhear part of a conversation in the next room. If it interests me, and I turn my real attention in that direction, I may continue to read the page word for word, and at the end I shall know nothing at all of it, but shall have a pretty clear view of what my neighbors in the next room have been talking about.

But at the beginning, I could perfectly well have left my neighbors to settle their own differences, and have turned my full attention to my page. In that case, I should have taken it in, and should know what it was about, when I came to the end of it. And it is a matter of universal experience, that we can control our attention perfectly, if we please; can turn it this way or that, as one turns a searchlight; can fix it on this subject or that, bringing it to a focus, or leaving it vague, just as we can focus our eye-sight on things on the material plane. Therefore the exercise of will-power in the field of the mind is a matter of common knowledge, all doubts of brain-psychologists to the contrary notwithstanding. Indeed, these very doubts are a proof of our freedom of will, for the mind can just as well conjure up chimeras, as visions of beauty; and much that has passed for philosophy, and theology too, for the matter of that, is simply a hunting ground of chimeras, in the wide field of the mind. The mind in its play is elastic enough to find room for the predestination of a Calvin, or the determinism of a brain-psychologist, just as, in by-gone days, it found room for the serpent-haired Medusa, or three-headed Cerberus, or the blind fury with the abhorred shears. Our wills are absolute, in the region of mind-images. We can build what we will, and can then, like Setebos in Browning's poem, pull the whole down again, just because we will it, from sheer caprice.

So that we have these facts: By an effort of attention, I can gain a clear and piercing view of any object. I can, at the same moment, paint a mind-picture of the same object, whose clearness will depend accurately on the force with which I choose to exert my power of attention. And, thirdly, I can at any later time, call up this mind-picture, and look at it. Such is the wonderful power of memory, as we actually use it. And I believe that memory depends, point by point, on the deliberately exerted effort of attention, and that it is not automatic at all; just as our walking depends on the incessant exercise of attention, and is not automatic; as anyone who is walking upstairs may convince himself, if the light is suddenly turned off. We hardly realize how much the feet depend on the ceaseless vigilance of the eyes, and how much the eyes depend on the ceaseless vigilance of the mind, the consciously exerted act of attention.

So much for memory, which is the basis of so very much of our mental life. Now let us turn to another faculty, even more wonderful. Let us begin by a simple illustration. Think of a red apple, resting, let us say, on a white table-cloth, a fine, plump, crimson apple, such as they grow out in Oregon. Now think of a green apple, a Rhode Island Greening, if you wish; very good and sweet, and daintily flavored. Now set beside it, on the white table-cloth, a yellow apple, a Reinette du Canada, for example, bright yellow when it is ripe. Now add a russet apple, brown, sweet, nutty in flavor. Look at all four of them, sitting

there before you, in the field of the mind. Now you are conscious of two things. First, you see a red, a green, a yellow and a brown apple, clearly distinguished by their colors. And second, and this is of tremendous importance, you are aware of the fact, by whatever process, that they are all apples, in spite of their difference of colors. You are able to lay the green apple upon the red, the yellow and the brown upon that, and to obtain a composite image, which shall be none of them, or all of them, whichever you wish to call it; but which shall be the notion "apple," a general abstraction, no particular apple, and at the same time all apples. This, I believe, is the basis of all reasoning, all intellectual activity, however complex. It rests primarily on the power of laying one mind-image on another, and thus gradually building up a composite mind-image, just as our photographers build up a composite photograph of the college-girl, or the presidential candidate, or the actor, or whatever it may be.

And into this process, two factors enter: the simple image-making power—the taking of the photographs, so to speak; and then the selective power, which gathers, so to say, all the college-girls together, all the statesmen together, all the actors together, and then makes the composite picture in each case. This rests primarily on the power to perceive likeness; to discern unity; and this, it seems to me, is a purely spiritual power, a kind of divine intuition, a divination. We gather our mind-pictures together, and then we bring them up to the oracle in the mind, the divining power, which pronounces that certain pictures have a common quality, an underlying unity, to which this divining power pierces with unerring skill. My own belief is, that this power of discernment is exactly what I have called it, a divine and spiritual power, something of the Divinity itself, which dwells in us, and which is the basis of all our intellectual life.

Perhaps the most striking, and at the same time the simplest expression of this faculty, is the process of numbering, of counting up. Let us illustrate. If, instead of taking four apples of different colors, red, green, yellow and brown—and we may note, in passing, that we have got the order of the colors correct; we have called up our mind-image of some forty lines back, without error; let us take instead, I say, four or half-a-dozen apples, all of the same color, green for example, and let us set them in a row, on the white table-cloth of our mind-field. Now we can begin and count, from beginning to end, one, two, three, four, five, six green apples; and we recognize the fact that the six apples are related by position, as well as by their being apples, and being green. They have this in common, that they are numbered off along our scale. This is natural enumeration.

But we may have purely artificial enumeration, such as, for example, the numbers of our alphabet. Even if there be a certain natural firstness

about a, as being the first sound that comes, when we open our mouths, there is no natural secondness about b, still less any natural thirdness or fourthness about c and d. Yet we choose to arrange them thus, in our minds, along the ideal scale of number in our thought; and we keep them in that order indefinitely. And on this purely artificial or subjective enumeration depends a thing as complex as the arrangement of words in a dictionary, where as many as a hundred thousand different words may be arranged on this simple plan, and are, in fact, so arranged; words standing for practically everything in the heavens above, and in the earth beneath, and in the waters which are under the earth: an epitome of the universe, in brief. And in virtue of the purely ideal and subjective enumeration, imposed on the letters by the mind, we can at once find any one of the hundred thousand words in the dictionary, the name of anything in heaven above or the earth beneath. Thus the single intellectual principle of numbering, which has no external equivalent, enables us to master, to permeate, to control the names of all things, and to call up any one at exactly the right moment. For we can look up any word in the dictionary at will, within a few seconds.

Thus the single spiritual fact of enumeration controls all these varied words, and dominates them completely. Looking with piercing mental vision at any word, we perceive, within the word, its invisible and ideal place in the entire number system, its exact place in the dictionary, and we look it up at once, and find it. I have no doubt that memory classifies in some very similar way, according to some natural system of classification which inheres in things, all the objects we observe.

But the point I wish to make, is this: that, in all effective mental action, there are two elements. The first is the bringing of the mind-image up before the bar of the intuition. The second is, the verdict given by the intuition, the oracle, which determines the nature and value of the mind image, just as we determine the exact place of a word in the dictionary, when we look at the word. I believe this intuition, this power of discernment, this inner oracle, is a spiritual power, a power of discerning real values, a power of perceiving real truth. It may be used well or ill, just as the hands or the tongue may be used well or ill; but it is capable of being used supremely well, as Phidias or Raphael used their hands; or as the sweet-tongued orator of the Pylians used his speech.

And I am further convinced that everyone instinctively believes himself to be possessed of this power of discerning truth, of determining real values; even the doubter believes he really knows that he does not know. And I cannot see how this power of knowing truth, this faculty which is the measure of the universe, can be anything but a divine power, akin to the Ruler of the universe, akin to the Divine. I cannot conceive how the brain-psychologist can believe himself in possession of truth, or able to attain to truth, while believing that conscious-

ness is but a fume of the brain. How should a hatful of pulp be the measure of the universe? How should its fumes have any relation at all to truth, any more than the steam of a kettle is a measure of truth? Yet even the brain-psychologist believes that his system is true; he believes in truth; and he is right, because he has indeed within him that wonderful oracle, that touchstone which discerns gold from dross, that real measure of things, that voice of the Divine, which declares infallible oracles. Every heterodox maker of foolish systems is just as good a witness for this divine faculty, as is the seer, the sage. For he has the conviction of true knowledge, of knowing truth; and this conviction could never conceivably arise but from the faculty itself.

So we have this divine oracle. And, by virtue of it, we make order among the mind-images. We perceive real relations, we see unity amid diversity, we gather, we garner, we range. And at last, little by little, we have a second universe within our minds, but a universe, classified, ordered, instantly available at each point, just as each word in the dictionary is instantly available. It is perfectly true that the image of the universe in the minds of most of us is not true nor real; but that is because, as we have seen before in the matter of food and the matter of sex, we have free will, the power to misuse as well as to use. We can build mind-images in heterogeneous confusion, pile upon pile, like monstrous cloud-castles, just as easily as we can build ordered edifices of truth. But the driving power of truth is ever at work, and will bring us in the end to obey our oracles, as we shall later see.

Just one word more, as to this driving-power of truth. We saw, in speaking of the search for food, that the natural driving-power of hunger will carry any species into every corner of the globe; and we quoted the moles, in the midst of their blind, pathetic pilgrimage. Well, there is a natural driving power in the mind, which compels every one of us to make as complete as we can our consciousness of the universe, and which will not let us rest, until our consciousness really is complete, extending to, and including, the entirety of things, not only in the earth beneath, but in the heaven above, and in the heaven of heavens.

As I write, a dauntless mariner is hastening toward the North Pole. Others are navigating the air. Yet others are plunging in the depths of the sea. Each one is driven by this same impelling power, which will never rest until we have all knowledge. Into hidden realms, psychical and spiritual, that force will drive us, until we enter the Holy of Holies, and become one with the Most High.

CHARLES JOHNSTON.

(To be continued.)

THE HINDU-ARYAN THEORY OF EVOLUTION.

D ID we need any proof of the difficulties that beset the path of the translator, the title of the very interesting little book that Dr. Rajan has given us, would furnish it, by its misuse of prepositions, for he calls it the "Hindu-Aryan Theory *on* Evolution."

In speaking of the sacred books of the East, Dr. Rajan says that when the technicalities used in those books are literally translated, "they often fail to convey the ideas of the author, and the coherence of the thought is lost." This is perfectly true, but it is equally true that in the effort to give the spirit rather than the letter, the translator may lose as completely the real meaning of the author. Dr. Rajan quotes Max Müller as saying, "We are constantly made aware of our deficiencies in being unable to catch and render accurately the minute shades of meaning, whether of inspired seers of the Upanishads, or the acute reasoners of the Vedanta school of philosophy. We find it almost impossible to give a close and faithful equivalent in English." And apart from the usual difficulties encountered by every translator, there is the fact pointed out by Dr. Rajan, that many of the terms used in these sacred books have a technical meaning, known only to the students whom he calls "traditional," meaning those to whom the secret doctrine has been handed down from generation to generation by "traditional" teachers. Here the translator endows an English adjective with a special meaning, finding it impossible to express his idea otherwise. Dr. Rajan's command of the English language is surprisingly good, but he occasionally has to draw upon his own resources, or give to an English word a meaning that it does not possess, and he has the usual struggle of foreigners with the definite article, who never seem to know when it should be put in and when left out.

But these are mere details, and only go to indicate the difficulties in the path of every translator, more especially, he who would try to embody the subtle expressions of the Sanskrit in a tongue so devoid of these niceties that every English metaphysician has to begin by inventing his own vocabulary as he finds those of his predecessors quite inadequate to his needs.

From the time of the Civil War in India, 3900, or 5000 years ago (Dr. Rajan has a lofty contempt for dates), the deepest and most important of the sacred teachings, and the explanations and definitions of the technical expressions used therein, were either not published at

all, or cancelled before they could be circulated. The books containing the true and complete theory of the Evolution of the Cosmos and of Man, the highest philosophy of the Hindu-Aryans, is in the safe keeping of the "Traditional Teachers," and is handed down orally from the Guides (or Gurus) to the Disciples. The Vedas, Upanishads, the Puranas and the Bhagavad-Gita, are composite works, each containing various theories, as the key of this or that philosophy, Monism, Dualism, or any other, be used to interpret their dark sayings. The complete Bhagavad Gita, which contains 1008 stanzas, has never come into general circulation, and never will. A complete exposition of the Hindu-Aryan theories of Evolution and Involution, has not thus far been printed in any language, as they have always been taught orally by the "Traditional Teachers" to their chosen disciples.

The Science and the Art of Raja-Yoga, according to Dr. Rajan, were brought to perfection by the early seers or Rishis, in the beginning of Hindu-Aryan history. They began by studying the problems of the constitution of man, and his different states of consciousness, waking, sleeping, dreaming, and dreamless sleep, and the principles which enabled him to remember and repeat his dreams, etc. After close observation and repeated experiments, they arrived at the conclusions upon which they built up their theories of Evolution. In order to preserve their methods and discoveries, they initiated their fittest students in the art of Raja-Yoga, which has been kept secret for many reasons. It is based upon psychological ("physical"?) facts, and is as distinctly a practical art as anything we know to-day.

Dr. Rajan's aim in the present work is to give an outline of (I) the Theory or Science of Raja-Yoga, which deals with (a) The Evolution of the Cosmos; (b) The Descent of the Universe and Man, otherwise known as Involution; and (c) the Ascent of Man; and (II) the Methods of Man's Ascent, known as the Art of Raja-Yoga. Students of Theosophy have been accustomed to speak of Involution and Evolution as applied to the progress of man and the Cosmos, and to consider their history as following similar lines.

As the soul has for its abode the physical body, made up of material things, the origin of these things must be studied before the soul can be comprehended. The first object of study of the ancient Hindu-Aryans was the construction of the Cosmos, and this study is the first step of the ladder leading us to the intimate knowledge of the "Self."

We will not stop to recapitulate those theories that Dr. Rajan rejects, but proceed at once to his own solution of the problem of creation, which he states as follows: "That which gives rise to illusory phenomena without itself undergoing any essential change is Para-Brahman, or the Efficient Cause."

As the sun radiates light and heat, so Para-Brahman, or the Efficient Cause (which answers to what we call "the Absolute") radiates Cosmic Conscious Energy or Will (Aksharum), and Cosmic Matter (Mula-prakriti), forming the Hindu Trinity. These two energies are unborn and endless in Para-Brahman, because they are one with it. At the time of Cosmic Activity this Cosmic Conscious Energy combines with Cosmic Matter, and works as the Cosmic Ego (Ishwara or the Logos). In constitution this Cosmic Ego is All-Knowledge; He is Real Being; He is the Knower; He is Bliss. As He is not entangled in matter, He is holy, and free from pain, and in character is Universal, and All-Pervading. This is the first Ego in the Cosmos, and all other Egos are but His reflection. In the "Trinity," Cosmic Conscious Energy is one root of the "Highest Self" (Ishwara). This theory is called Adwaitam, or pure Monism.

Differentiation takes place when Cosmic Activity springs from the Cosmic Ego and illumines Cosmic Matter, and this illumination causes the existence of the three states of matter called "Tri-guna," namely "Mental Matter" (Satva-Guna), "Vital Sense Matter" (Raja-Guna), and "Vital Matter" (Tamo-Guna), and they are all in the atomic condition.

The reflection of the Cosmic Ego upon the different states of matter has given rise to the whole Cosmos in all its different kingdoms, just as varied reflections are given by different mirrors. This is why the Cosmic Ego is said to be the "Material Cause" for the appearance of the universe. And now for the effect of His Light upon these different states of matter.

I. The reflection of the Cosmic Ego, or Supreme Being, on "Mental Matter," caused the inherence of a portion of Himself therein, and this portion is called an Individual Ego (Jiva-Atma). This Individual Ego inherits every property of the Cosmic Ego, namely, Para-Brahman, a portion of Cosmic Conscious Energy, and Cosmic Matter. In this group of three, Para-Brahman or the Efficient Cause is common to both the Cosmic and the Individual Ego; the other two (that is Matter and Energy) are inherited by all Individual Egos directly from the Cosmic Ego. This inherited portion of the Cosmic Conscious Energy in the individualized state is called "Vritti," which the Doctor translates as "Individual Conscious Energy;" the inherited portion of Cosmic Matter is called "Karana Sarira," which he calls "Primordial Matter." This is the first state of Matter in which the Individual Conscious Energy is enveloped, and combined with which it is called an Individual Ego. This Individual Conscious Energy in its turn illumines Mental Matter through its veil of Primordial Matter, and this illumination causes the existence of the "Intellect" (Buddhi) and "the Mind."

The differentiation of the Intellect and the Mind takes place after

the manifestation of the Individual Ego; therefore these two principles belong to its Involution and not to the Evolution of the Cosmic Ego. The latter has neither "Intellect" nor "Mind" in an individualized state, as the Individual Ego has. If it had, it would be a limited being, a larger man, subject to birth and death. Therefore there is no such thing as "Universal Mind."

II. The reflection of the Cosmic Ego on Vital-Sense-Matter (Raja-Guna) causes the existence of the five Vital-Sense-Forces, namely, Vyana, Prana, Udana, Samana, and Apana. These are the vehicles that convey sensation to the Mind and the Intellect. They are the seats of "Ignorance" jointly and severally, and are the instruments by which we govern our bodies in their various aspects.

III. The reflection of the Cosmic Ego on Vital Matter (Tamo-Guna) causes the existence of two forces, the Transforming Force, and the Delusive Force. The Transforming Force causes the existence of the five Vital Elements* in this wise: it directly causes the existence of Akasa; Akasa causes Vayu; Vayu causes Tejas; Tejas causes Apu, and Apu causes Prithivi. Each of these elements is invisible in an uncombined state, and even the combination of all five is invisible under certain conditions, for these Elements belong to the invisible world. Everything we see, however, is due to their combinations. Literally, Prithivi means earth; Apu, water; Tejas, light, heat, or fire; Vayu, wind or air; Akasa, ether or space. There is no equivalent for these terms in English, and the literal translation is quite misleading. These "Elements" are the units of different states and qualities of matter, and when combined in different ways produce different results. According to Hindu-Aryan science every "Element" of modern chemistry is a combination of these five Vital Elements, even the gas hydrogen. The positive Ion of the Electron theory, is the "Akasa" of Hindu-Aryan psychology. The other four may stand for negative Ions of different qualities, but they are not the identical things, and are only cited to give an idea of what these Vital Elements are. Akasa is the basis of them all, and there can be no combination of any or all without Akasa.

The "Transforming Force" (Vikshepa Sakti) has four aspects, (1) the "Serpentine Force" (Kundali Sakti); (2) the "Integrating Force;" (3) the "Disintegrating Force," and (4) the "Illusory Force."

1. The function of the Serpentine Force is to keep the Individual Ego, the Intellect, the Mind, and the five Vital-Sense-Forces coiled up, or enveloped, as it were, to form an entity, and besides this, it acts as both the positive and the negative poles of that entity. Again, these form the clothing of the Vital-Sense-Forces, and enable them to evolve into special senses and the organs of senses.

* Akasa, Vayu, Tejas, Apu, and Prithivi.

2. The function of the Integrating Force is to cause a thing to grow, as when a flower becomes a fruit, in which process we find additional bulk and weight, change in color, expansion in dimensions, and gravitative adjustment.

3. The function of the Disintegrating Force is to eliminate excessive material, or to cause the disappearance of a thing.

4. The function of the Illusory Force is to show one thing for another, to keep the real hidden, and to show the unreal. It conceals the cause and shows the effect.

The process of the involution of the different states of matter then, may be summed up thus: The Individual Ego illumines Mental Matter, and thus causes the existence of the Intellect and the Mind. The five Vital-Sense-Forces conjointly with the Serpentine Force, shine upon the Mind with such power that it becomes completely subservient to them. The Intellect is the spectator of all this, but indirectly, and is not entangled in their clutches as the Mind is, although it belongs to the group of principles which make up a perfect unembodied entity. This entity forms one of the stumbling blocks in the path of the translator, as Dr. Rajan can find no better name for it than "Ignorant Entity" (Pra-Ajan), although it would seem as if he meant by it, the reincarnating Ego, because he goes on to describe the process of its reincarnation. The birth place and the circumstances of its parents are determined by the results of the deeds of its past lives, and it is subject to death and rebirth over and over again until the Individual Ego attains that knowledge which leads to Atonement.

The results of the unmeritorious deeds of past lives cause the following obstacles to obtaining this knowledge:

1. They cause one to forget or ignore one's own Ego (Jiva-Atma). To understand it, and its relation to the Cosmic Ego, one has first to learn these theories of the Evolution of the Cosmos, and the Involution of the Universe and Man.

2. The sufferings of this life are in proportion to the unmeritorious deeds performed in one's past life. In order to obtain a happy life in the future one has to perform many meritorious deeds.

3. Forgetfulness, which is the characteristic of the Mind, and Ignorance, which is the characteristic of the five Vital-Sense-Forces, cause one to lose the knowledge of one's own Individual Ego, and its relation to the Cosmic Ego, and results in repeated births and deaths. In order to avoid this, one must have direct cognition of one's Individual Ego and its relation to the Cosmic Ego, which alone frees one from the pain of repeated births and deaths, and enables one to enjoy "Eternal Happiness." By doing meritorious deeds *with unselfish motive* (this is the only trace of anything ethical in this system) one prepares the way for learning the secrets of the Transforming Force. The first secret is,

how the Serpentine Force helps the Vital-Sense-Forces to ensnare the Mind; the second is the process of Integration; the third is the process of Disintegration, and the fourth is the Illusory process of the Transforming Force. When these faculties have been acquired, one becomes able to read the records of one's own previous life, and that of others also.

The Delusive Force denies the existence of anything that is not perceptible to our senses.

This first part of the Hindu-Aryan theory of the Evolution of the Cosmos and the Descent of the Universe and Man, is followed by the second part, on the Ascent of Man. It begins with an analysis of the physical body, and the definition of *Kosa*, which we have been used to call *sheath*, and thought of as containing the soul as a scabbard contains a sword, a very faulty metaphor. But Dr. Rajan defines "Kosa" as "matter in any form or state" and divides the physical body into five aspects of matter: (1) the physical body, "Ana-Maya-Kosa;" (2) The Life-Sustaining Body (the Astral), "Prana-Maya-Kosa;" (3) Mind, "Manas, or Mano-Maya-Kosa;" (4) Intellect, *Buddhi* ("Vijnana-Maya-Kosa") and (5) Bliss (or "Ananda-Maya-Kosa"). (Each of these divisions contains the word *Maya*, and would seem to point to the fact that these varied aspects of matter are but illusions, one and all.)

Five and not seven, is the predominant number in this philosophy: the organs and systems of the human body are divided into five groups, the Vital-Sense-Forces are five, the Vital Elements are five, the constituents of Mind are five, the states of Consciousness are five. It will be readily seen that these classifications rest upon a purely material basis, and the highest division of man, the "Bliss-Body," Dr. Rajan explains, is a state of consciousness in which a "Brahma Varishtan" (the highest degree of "Holy Man") clearly understands that there is no difference between the Cosmic Ego and the Individual Ego. This "direct cognition" gives him Eternal Bliss, and as this state is enjoyed from within the premises of "Primordial Matter" (*Karana-Sarira*), the attribute "Body" (*Kosa*) is added to Bliss, making "Ananda-Maya-Kosa."

"As Cosmic Matter (*Mula-Prakriti*) is the fountain-head of all the states of matter in the Universe, so is Primordial Matter (*Karana-Sarira*) the fountain-head of the different states of matter in an individual." A *Brahma Varishtan* or Holy Man of the highest degree in the physical body, when he has expiated all the results of his previous deeds, becomes a *Videha-Mukta*, meaning that he has become one with Cosmic Conscious Energy, and free from matter of any sort.

It will be readily seen that this system of philosophy is absolutely material and self-centered and that no glimmer of brotherly love enters into it. Good deeds are to be performed for the sake of acquiring merit,

"with an unselfish motive," of course, if one can manage it. It reminds one of the childish promise that a splendid present should be his who could think for ten consecutive mornings of a red fox without thinking of his tail. To heap up meritorious deeds for the sake of a good balance to one's credit, but with a perfectly unselfish motive, involves a mental agility difficult indeed to the western mind, even when Dr. Rajan naïvely suggests that the more meritorious deeds you do, the less time you will have to do unmeritorious ones!

But the book is a perfect storehouse of information on the nature of man and the universe, and the key to many an occult secret lies in its pages. The explanation of all "phenomena" is there, very lightly veiled, but nevertheless impossible to perform by any but the trained student. How long and how difficult that training, Dr. Rajan explains, and this is one of the most valuable things in the book, as showing the utter absurdity, and worse, the absolute danger, of so many of the pseudo-Raja-Yoga systems that have sprung up of late years among us. The chief value of the book to a student of Theosophy, is the clear and logical sequence of its thought, and the light it throws on various difficult points by a new interpretation of Sanskrit terms. Dr. Holmes once said that the words of all sacred books needed to be de-polarized, and it is beginning to be as necessary for the theosophical writings as for other scriptures.

KATHARINE HILLARD.

"An overthrow which redounds to the glory of God is not defeat, but victory. Nor indeed is such an overthrow any genuine overthrow; any more than prostration is a fall, or self-sacrifice destruction. Bear witness, Gethsemane and Calvary!"

CHRISTINA ROSSETTI.

THE RELIGIONS OF JAPAN.

WE cannot, in any true sense, speak of the religion of Japan as ancient. Japan itself has no obscure history; the details of its growth are easy, and it is obvious that "in the beginning" the inhabitants represented a composite tribal people.

Among tribal people are always to be found scattered survivals of legendary myths, and when the Japanese are historically met with, these myths have already taken on permanent form. We realize almost with dismay that the second century of our own era brings us to the "primitive" religion of a people whose national history is as young as Christianity. The glamor of the Far East falls away; we are face to face with the records of the history of a state beginning when the Roman empire had fallen. As compared with Dravidian, or Aryan records, those of Shinto, the early religion of the people of Dai Nippon (or land of the sun's origin) are modern. That their roots were in the far past is no doubt true; but that far past, as we dimly perceive it, offers no promise of inspiration, affords no leeway for spiritual aspiration.

We find ourselves in close relation, not only to primitive symbolism, but to primitive conceptions of the coarsest and grossest kind. There is nothing in the early books (which represent the first conscious effort of the people of Nippon to construct a basis for their religious hope) to suggest any higher influence than that of nature worship in its crudest form, that is to say, in the form in which it suggests mere wonder at ordinary happenings without sufficient mental development to inquire into hidden causes.

Reliable information with regard to this nature worship dates back to the middle of the sixth century of our era, but the first actual document is a century and a half later, when, Chinese influence already established, the religion of Japan had taken on that composite form which distinguishes it to-day. Shintoism, the way of the Gods; Confucianism, the way of morality or order, and Buddhism, the way of the intellect, were the threefold strands of Japanese spirituality. The formative period was long. That which was young, the primitive belief, tangible, concrete, objective, coming into contact with the influences of an ancient civilization, of necessity gave way; intellect slowly awakened: China stood as the embodiment of order, harmony, relationship. Its cosmogony was already many centuries old, its philosophy established beyond dispute, its history that of conquest and unrivalled ambition.

It offered thus to an ignorant and debased people (a people slowly

arising out of tribal conditions into unity), *knowledge*. Unity had been brought about in the usual way, by the supremacy of one peculiar tribe, a tribe, in the case of Japan, apparently coming from the southwest, under the leadership of a man greater than his fellows, who, by his recognized superiority laid the foundation of the coming empire. Of this conquest we find traces in the Jimnu myth, not, as a recent scholar points out, that there ever was a conqueror named Jimnu, but that conquest did occur under a certain leadership around which grew up myths and legends.

Such are in fact the beginnings of all history, but in the case of Japan the events so enshrined in folk-lore bore special relation to the future evolution of a race, submerged as it were, by a people of immense antiquity. Korea, from which quarter no doubt Chinese civilization entered Nippon, was in the sixth century largely Buddhistic—and as a result we have a hybrid religion in which it is exceedingly difficult to recognize the pure teaching of the founder. Probably no religion has suffered so much from amalgamation as Buddhism. Its central doctrine of Impermanence commends it to all observers of life, and no doubt, in large measure, accounts for its adoption by nations naturally so opposed in theory and practice as, for example, the Chinese and the Hindoos.

Primitive people appear to recognize in *change* their most striking experience. Probably the majority of myths are founded upon it. *Something happens*: the dormant mind records the happening, but does not as yet inquire the cause; imagination is not sufficiently awakened. Many centuries may pass before, in strict relation to its evolution, a tribe shall rise to conscious speculation—when it does so rise, the birth of a spiritual religion follows and conscious speculation is accompanied by intuition acceptance. In Japan it is quite clear that this moment in race evolution was not even imminent when an alien people imposed upon a conquered race (or rather upon many associated tribes) a central religious idea. The conqueror being of Chinese derivation, this central idea was harmony, order—not, be it clearly understood, the ideal of the Aryan, of unity as universal, but the idea of order in the objective universe. Chinese religion was in the main objective; in Taoism only was the subjective ideal presented, and in early Japanese religion we find no trace of its dominant transcendentalism. Such at any rate are the conditions of Japan's outward history, and it is not a little significant to compare the results of a religious idea alien to the earliest traditions of a people, superimposed from external sources, and those of one innately conceived by the people themselves. In Japan the blossom of religion is distinctly patriotism, a recognition of the claims of relationship; in India, the trend of spiritual aspiration is the reverse. Patriotism is a sentiment but recently born in the mind of the Hindoo; its source is

not religious, and its claims are heard only when the deeper aspiration of universal brotherhood is, for the moment, in danger.

The known history of Japanese thought goes back to our fifth century, but the oldest documents are of about 712 A. D.; there is no evidence that time was recorded before the sixth century. We cannot, however, question that the Japanese archipelago was inhabited centuries earlier; we find such evidence in its mythology, in its geological remains, shell heaps and the like; but all such testimony emphasizes the conditions as those of a people primitive in the true sense, *i. e.*, not having arisen as yet to the mental stature of fully evolved man. The system of worship which received its name in later centuries, Shinto, the way of the Gods, was, when first encountered as history, based upon songs, chants and "*norito*" (or services) of undoubtedly early origin coming down through oral tradition. *Shinto* is the Chinese equivalent of the early Japanese *Kami no Michi*, and it is claimed by scholars that the final *to* in Shinto is the equivalent of "Tao." But wherever, or however, the seed of this religion was planted, whether it originated in the archipelago itself, or whether it came as a wind-blow from some conquering tribe, it is evident that its development was Japanese; it is in fact the only true Japanese strand in the threefold religion of later history. Our judgment of *Shinto* is mainly based upon authorities, *The Kojiki*, *The Nihongi*, which are the canonical books and which have been thoroughly translated and annotated by English scholars. In the preface to *The Kojiki*, which assumed the form of literature in 712 A. D., and which was evidently a labor of love on the part of the compiler Yasumaro, he says: "Now when chaos began to condense, but force and form were not yet manifest, and there was naught named, who could know its shape? Nevertheless, heaven and earth first parted and the three deities performed the commencement of creation. The passive and active forces then developed and the two spirits became the ancestors of all things."

As compared with the well-known Vedic hymn, this is sufficiently prosaic and is representative of the entire content of *The Kojiki*, which is in the main the record of the marvelous adventures of gods and goddesses who are in fact part of Nature herself.

The Japanese constantly assert that their civilization is far older than these facts warrant, and so determined were the earlier compilers of religious records to establish an ancient history that eight years after the compilation of *The Kojiki*, the book called *Nihongi*, or *Chronicles of Japan*, was written, giving spurious dates of events supposed to have happened 1,500 years before, and even *The Kojiki*, which is for the most part an honest record, states that the Korean teacher Wani brought the *thousand character classic* to Japan in 285 A. D., while the Chinese themselves assert that it was not composed until 550 A. D.

But the question of antiquity in itself has less interest for the student of religions than the transparency of the myths and legends which forms the basis of Japanese idealism. Undoubtedly its tales of gods and goddesses are the veiled happenings of tribal and internecine warfare. As in the far more ancient tales of *The Mahabharata* we trace the warfare of antagonistic races, so in the foundations of Shintoism we realize the attempt to emphasize and determine supremacy. The ante-natal preparation for Mikadoism may be found there, and the germ of ancestor worship must be sought in the effort to connect the natural course of human life with descent from the great gods and goddesses.

The sun, the central object of early worship, was in Japanese myth a goddess, the fertile originator of earth and all its glories; later on the Mikado is "the from heaven shining great deity," his "praises are fulfilled by setting up the stout pillars of the great house," in other words, by supporting the power and dignity of the gods.

Scholars are of opinion that originally the worship of Japan was pure in ideal and that the debased character of *The Kojiki* is due to the fact that by the time it was compiled Confucianism and later Buddhism had cast contempt upon the native gods, and that, as they fell from a higher estate, phallicism and all its corruption cast its shadow over them. Hence, the nature gods and goddesses appear as enjoying the lowest intrigues. Goddesses produce unlimited children and when Jzanami has deigned to bear many hundred myriads of gods, she also deigns to bear her "dear youngest child of all, the fire producer god" at whose birth her own death occurs. Her husband Jzanagi slays the fire god and follows Jzanami into Hades, or root-land, whence other gods are born by her. Jzanami and Jzanagi play the most important parts of the mythological drama. From first to last *The Kojiki* is prosaic, in parts coarse beyond compute and at times untranslatably obscene.

Its records begin with three gods already existant in the plain of high heaven, "the deity master of the august center of heaven," "the high august producing wondrous deity," and "the divine producing deities." Being born they die, then from a "reed shoot" are born two more heavenly deities who pass away without descendants, then again two, and finally appear five couples and the drama of human existence begins, the last two being recognized as "the male deity who invites" and "the female deity who invites" to wit, Jzanagi no Kami, and Jzanami no Kami. From their union spring islands, plains, rivers, elements, spirits of every kind and description, and to them are traced families whose origin is divine. From such foundation springs Mikadoism, the Mikado being, to the Japanese, unquestionably of spiritual descent. received the throne from the highest deities and his sword of conquest,

his mirror of reflection and his spear of protection are presented to him by the sun goddess. Upon this foundation is built the succession of emperors, and the beginnings of real history are traceable; but even as late as 661 A. D., demons are familiarly introduced. Finally gods vanish in "the light of common day" and historical sequence follows; recorders are appointed and political records rescue Shintoism from extinction. But, primitive as the way of the Gods in the main may be, we are yet aware in studying *The Kojiki* that another influence is at work. Already China has overshadowed the Flowery Land, already the idea of *order* as heaven's decree has entered the popular mind, and from henceforth the relations of the emperor, divinely born as he is, are eternally established. *Relationship*, the basic law of Confucius, is at once origin and explanation of Japanese ancestor worship.

And not only was the Mikado himself of Divine origin, chosen by the sun goddess as representative ruler, but what in modern thought would be *aristocracy*, is traceable in the same way. Families are related to the gods and when this is recognized the place of each is already established. Religion can be summed up in a sentence: "fear the gods, obey the emperor, reverence the families." A creed amply sufficient for government and retaining to our own day a supreme influence.

As we seek the origin of Shintoism in *The Kojiki*, in like manner we find its evolution in the *Norito*, or state rituals—forms to be used upon occasions, and in *The Nihongi* (which dates back to the eighth century) we have what purport to be the true chronicles, basis of all Japan's later history.

Such an estimate of early Shintoism is necessarily imperfect. We are unable to assert positively at what date Confucianism entered actively into its ideals, or, to speak more definitely, at what period the learning of China made itself felt. Probably the religious elements of the Chinese people were amalgamated by the Japanese long before the concrete teachings of the sages made their way into *The Nihongi*. Be that as it may, it is certain that in the sixth century of our era, Confucianism was no longer supreme in China itself; and Buddhism, making its way northward had entered the middle kingdom and had become amazingly popular there. Confucianism reaching Japan from Korea was influenced both by Taoism and by the doctrine of what is known as the Mahayana or greater vehicle of Buddhism. The clear intellectual concepts of Gautama the Buddha had been unable to withstand the metaphysical subtleties of early Brahmanism. Within a short time after his death the meeting held at Vesali to determine matters of dispute, originally relating to questions within the Order, proved beyond question that feeling among the disciples differed upon fundamental points. What the Arian controversy was to Christianity the meeting of the council at Vesali was to Buddhism. The discussions which brought it about had

regard to the ten rules ordained by Gautama for government in the Viharas, for, as almost invariably happens, these external rules had assumed a new prominence and threatened the existence of the society itself. When we reflect that individual liberty is the goal of Buddhism, we realize that the mind itself became the greatest enemy of freedom.

When new truth falls upon soil unsuited to it, the mind accepts the doctrine as explained by each successive teacher in accordance with its own development, in other words, *Manas*, the mind, conflicts with *Buddhi*, or spiritual perception, and in no case has it done so more disastrously than in Buddhism. The liberty of the emancipated Gautama became the enchainment of the unemancipated disciples. There was in fact no possibility at the council of Vesali of harmonizing the different intellectual concepts of the disputants and there was imminent danger lest in their eagerness to carry out their individual understandings of the Master's teachings they should reject what had been essentially new in his doctrine. Old forms of thought reasserted themselves and in a short time as many as seventeen different schools had been established, before, in fact, 250 B. C., when *The Katha Vathu* was written.

The most important difference of opinion in those early days related to the Buddha himself; was he in fact a man like other men who by contemplation had reached enlightenment or were his birth and whole experience supernatural? Upon this critical point there exist even to-day great differences of opinion among the learned, but as far as the religion of Japan is concerned we must bear in mind that when we meet Buddhism in the Flowery Kingdom, it is no longer primitive Buddhism, but is in fact a complex ceremonial religion with a full list of gods and *Bhodisats*. In some respects this Buddhism of Japan differs both from those known as the *Hinayana* and the *Mahayana*. It has features peculiarly its own, even when first met with, and others due to its amalgamation with the philosophy of China.

When after the disruption of Vesali the adherents of Gautama spread in a northerly direction, they encountered different religious observances in every country through which they passed, that is to say, in Nepaul, Mongolia, Manchuria, China, Korea and finally Japan. Many of these observances were taken up and welded into the new religion so completely and so inextricably that when we encounter Buddhism in Japan it has lost all resemblance to the pure teaching of Gautama. Its intellectual pre-eminence, its demand for self-government and self-control, its contempt for idolatry and for extremes of every kind, its middle path, its attainment of *Nirvana* and its four noble truths—have become a hybrid religion with complex relationships.

"No greater contrast," says a recent scholar, "can be imagined than that between the teachings of Shinto, the way of the Gods, and that of Bushido, the way of the Buddhas," yet their doctrines have been so

co-related that the Japanese themselves appear to accept them both. Shintoism is without complexity, its temples are simple, undecorated, without idols or symbols, save the mirror and the stored insignia. It has few sacred books save *The Kojiki* and *The Nihongi*, its influence is due to legend and to sacred memories of the heroic dead, of those divine heroes who remain forever as the ancestors of the people. While Buddhism, even in the sixth century had attained an extraordinary complexity.

Already at that time an influential monk of Peshawar in the Punjab had written the first text-book of a creed in which he recognized at least six gods; he incorporated into his *Yoga-Cara-Bhumi-Castra*, much mysticism and some of the older tantric doctrines. Here we find the Siddhis (hidden powers), Dharani and Mandala; and when this book, translated into Chinese, reached Japan, it was already authoritative. There was also the *Lotus of the Good Law*, the Saddharma Pundarika, in which the transcendental ideal had entirely replaced the more moderate concepts of Gautama, in which the welding together of the Jatakas, or legends of the earlier lives of the Buddha is made to serve for a long list of earlier Bodhisats.

Thus, in Japan, from the start we find the conditions of the Mahayana school accepted and no period in the history of her race is more momentous than that seventh century in which a full fledged hierarchical religion, claiming indeed to be universal, encroached upon, and finally took entire possession of the faith of the people.

It at first commended itself to the more enlightened and educated portion of the race, those immediately related to the Mikado; and we have an interesting account of the conflicts which preceded its final adoption by an entire people. And we must remember that this adoption was not the result of a slow amalgamation but of an imperial edict.

All Japanese authorities agree in the main details of the events which followed; how, in A. D. 534, a man from China brought an image of the Buddha and set it up to worship. It was called "the foreign country god." He set the fashion of discussing the teachings of Gautama, or, as the Japanese call him, Saka. Then a Korean king sent golden images of the Buddha to the Mikado, and some of the sutras and sacred books. Within fifty years yet other images appeared, and the then minister of state converted his house into a temple. But, soon afterwards, a pestilence occurring, the people ascribed it to the anger of their own gods and in a wave of opposition the temple was burned and the idols thrown into the river. But the tide soon turned again and priests were invited from Korea to instruct the unwilling people. Finally a son being born to the Mikado and the Empress Suiko, the priests threw all their influence and power into the propaganda; the son,

Shōtōku, was canonized and his image may be seen in thousands of temples.

Legends in Japan assert that Buddhism only became popular when Amida, "the boundless merciful one," reincarnated as a woman and gave birth to Shōtōku; but once established as a state religion, Buddhism quickly took on national form. Hundreds of Japanese went to China and Korea to study the scriptures, and returning, founded new sects.

In A. D. 735 a large monastery was built for the new sect known as Kegon, and from this period by imperial command temples were built in every province. Then came the erection of the colossal image of the Buddha and about this time the priests of Shintoism bestirred themselves and finally asserted that their great deity, the Sun goddess, was an incarnation of an old Hindoo god.

It required probably fully two centuries to complete the amalgamation of the faith of the common people who clung to the old familiar Shinto gods, but through its Yoga Cara system closely allied to Tantric rites, Buddhism finally commended itself to the lower cravings of the uneducated, and the effort of the Buddhists was crowned with success when they succeeded in making Shinto gods into Bodhisats, or Buddhas to be.

As in Brahmanism the hold of the priests is dependent upon the universality of the every day teachings, so in Buddhism the lofty intellectual concepts of Gautama were in process of time diffused and metamorphosed, until under their name the lowest religious practices were permitted.

The teacher who brought about the final acceptance by the people of Buddhist gods, was a priest named Kukai, known as Kobo Daishi; later myths and legends proclaimed him divine. He is the supposed author of *The Deva Nagari*, or God alphabet, but probably was only the interpreter. Under his influence the Yoga teachings of the Hindoos became the Japanese Riyobu.

As time passed, more and more of the early Shinto gods and goddesses took on Buddhistic names and forms and the process of combining purely Japanese practices with systems originating in India continued.

Ingrained in Japanese idealism is, as we have seen, patriotism, hence the flower of all her history is to be sought among the Samurai with their lofty ideal of loyalty.

It is impossible within the limit of a magazine article to do more than glance at the many sects which have dominated Buddhism in succeeding centuries. Foremost among them was the Shingon Shu, or sect of the true word, of which Vagra Bodhi, a great preacher, was the founder in 720 A. D., which is in fact the teaching of an esoteric as opposed to the formal exoteric doctrines; it is the setting forth of what

constitutes the secret doctrine of Theosophy, the possibility namely of attaining Buddhahood in the present life. Such teaching can be found in the Gnosis of early Christianity and, for the matter of that, in the earliest records of all ancient religious history.¹ Somewhat akin to it was the teaching of the Zen sect, both showing how far it was possible to diverge from the teachings of the Hinayana and invest those of the Mahayana with complex and metaphysical concepts.

The Japanese themselves recognize six sects as of almost equal prominence; three of them, however, are known as sub-sects, as having derived their essential teachings from the earlier ones. The Zen sect is essentially contemplative and teaches that apart from all the doctrinal contents of the scriptures there is a secret doctrine not communicated by utterance at all. By training, by meditation, the disciple attains the truth that is in Buddha, in his thought, in other words by illumination; "thought" to use the words of the canon, "transmitted by thought."

The Shin sect is called that of the pure land; and the pure land of peace is gained by faith. Repetition of prayer, or "even the hearing of the name of Amitabha will enable one to obtain immeasurable happiness." There are differences between the teachings of the Pure Land sect and those of the Pure Path, which, however, are both opposed to primitive Buddhism in that faith has replaced knowledge and worship has taken the place of strenuous effort. But the new teachings were to find opposition in those of Nichiren, who, in A. D., 1222, was in fact the prototype of our own Luther. A member of the Tendai sect, he based his teachings upon the *Saddharma Pundarika*, or *Lotus of the Good Law*, and his sect became popular as the Nichiren Shu. He was supposed to have gained miraculously a knowledge of the entire Buddhist canon which he converted into a formula always in the mouth of his disciples Namu-myō-ho-ren-ge'kyo: "oh the sutra of the Lotus of the wonderful law." He completed the conversion of Buddhism into a perfect paradox of mythology and fable. He was a radical believer in the divinity of Japan and of every Japanese, and all his effort was directed to the extension of his faith to every class of mind. His pantheon included all possible Buddhas, all possible saints, all righteous men and heroes. He made Japan the center of the universe and the rays of her central sun extended to the very lowest of her people, etas and outcasts included. Hence, in spite of its superstition and corruption it did, in its own way, proclaim for the Japanese at all events a universal brotherhood; even the canon of the Nichiren sect is an object of worship.

It is evident that Nichiren understood human nature in its most complex relations. His followers were encouraged to believe in verbal inspiration and to pay divine honors to every jot and tittle of the sutras. "They are," says an eminent scholar, "the triad of the three precious ones (or jewels), the Buddha, the law, and the order."

Of the prominent sects of Japanese Buddhism two, the Tendai and the Nichiren are essentially popular in that they prescribe one religion for the monks and quite another for the people; in other words, they have symbolic and realistic doctrines. They, in opposition to the Shin sect, insist that faith is not sufficient; man must work out his own salvation. Charms, exorcism, superstitions of every sort appeal to the uneducated, while, as must always be the case in a religion originally as intellectual as that of the Buddha, the inner purified teachings attract the intelligent.

This then, as far as Buddhism is concerned, was its culmination in Japan; no alteration of moment occurred, and the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries saw its full ceremonial glory, its revival of splendor and of art, its civilizing influences among the learned, its complete victory over the people. The sixteenth century saw its decay. The feudal system split into fragments; the country became the prey of civil war after civil war. Sect fought sect, and Buddhism for the only time in its long history was deluged in blood. Early in the sixteenth century Portuguese Christianity entered Japan and later the recurrence of Confucianism weakened the hold of Buddhism as an intellectual force and although it reawakened for a time, it became, as far as influence upon the people was concerned, of no account at all in the eighteenth century.

We then enter upon the modern period more or less familiar to all students of our time. The conflict is no longer that of Shintoism, Confucianism or Buddhism, but of all three against Christianity. Whether, as in the past, with three distinct religions welded into one, and indistinguishable in their literature, it will be possible for Buddhism in our time to amalgamate Christianity or for Christianity to envelop the hybrid concepts of old Japan, none can say, but one thing remains clearly certain, the dominant spirit in the country is the principle inherent in its earliest religion. Patriotism, loyalty, the worship of ancestral ideals, in fact the underlying spirit of Shinto, the way of the Gods, or as the Japanese express it, Yamato-Damashū, is best exemplified in the "Samurai." Hence we can do no better than realize that the hope of Japan must be sought in the changing ideals of the Samurai themselves.

In the eighteenth century the revival of pure Shinto determined that *loyalty* should replace the "filial duty" of Confucius. But loyalty as interpreted by ignorance leads to sad results; no sacrifices have been too great to make in its name. Human beings under its sway are without rights; at its command the most sacred obligations are valueless. Suicide, for the merely imaginable good of a general or above all of an emperor, became commendable under almost any circumstance; "better to die than live in the shadow of an unfulfilled duty," better any sacrifice than disobedience. The story of Japanese chivalry is a tale of incredible horrors

of the deaths of thousands of men, women and children by hari-kari. Self-sacrifice for an ideal assumed gigantic proportions, and it was especially fatal in regard to woman. The sacrifice of the honor of wife or daughter at the mere wish of a superior was looked upon as a noble form of virtue. "Let each one die for duty, there is naught else to do," was the teaching as late as 1857. And if we ask what constitutes duty to the Samurai we gain the ready reply, loyalty to country, clan, family or superior.

To a conscientious Samurai no virtue equals that of obedience, and it is easy to forecast the result of an ethic which condemns all individual freedom whether of husband, wife or child. It is equally clear that in face of such an ideal inferiors must always be sacrificed at the bidding of superiors. The condition of woman under the law in Japan is determined by it; she is an inferior being, subject to the will of father or husband, of value only as mother, called upon many times in the history of her race to prostitute herself for the good of a superior, father, husband or brother.

But the last fifty years have seen vital changes in the principles of the Samurai themselves. The same loyalty to ideals permits and indeed to-day inculcates the laws of a higher humanitarianism. Politically, changes are taking place which deprive the emperor of despotic power and oblige him to regard the people's will. In family relations concubinage is being abolished, the rights of wife and mother are becoming recognized, at least by the better educated, although they are not as yet legally enforced, and as years pass we find a growing recognition of individual liberty. A new Japan, evidenced in the late war, will carry into its future the highest ethical ideal of the human race, that of a universal brotherhood, and the essential element of Shinto will remain in the religious patriotism of an entire people. Japan must forever be to its own race "the divine land," the emperor "the divine ruler," but divine to the Japanese does not convey the idea of supernaturalism, but rather of something superior, worshipful, consecrated.

The belief in the continued power of the spirits of the past is not based on dogma. It is the essential, emotional characteristic of a people imbued with the ideal of reverence. And because its roots are in the hearts of the people themselves, whatever outward form religion may assume, whether that of China, of Buddhism or of Christianity, its inherent faith which will animate the people themselves, will be Shinto, the way of the gods. Under new names, and with new forms, the spirit of loyalty will work out a future greater, in all probability, than that dreamed of in the ages of the gods themselves.

JANET E. RUUTZ-REES.

JOAN OF ARC.

THE first quarter of the fifteenth century saw France at its lowest ebb. The English had conquered all the land north of the Loire, while the land to the south was split and devastated by opposing factions, whose one aim was the advancement of self. The irresponsible Dauphin still held a few castles along the banks of the Loire. In order to gain access to the fertile fields of southern France, England was invading these possessions from the north, at the same time making an alliance with the Duke of Burgundy, whose domain then lay to the southeast. The Dauphin was thus being hemmed in, and as the fall of his stronghold, Orleans, was then considered certain, he was preparing to escape to Italy. In the midst of these events appeared that exalted figure, Joan of Arc, whose commanding presence and inspiring leadership turned cowards into heroes and defeats into triumphs. The facts about her military exploits are too well known to require repetition here, but the spiritual and religious aspects of the girl's nature are well worthy of our attention.

Joan of Arc must indeed have had unusual strength of character and other qualities of a very high order, to have been entrusted with the salvation of France at such a crisis in its history. A peasant by birth, and of no education, she combined such complete knowledge of the training and manipulation of soldiers, the placing of artillery, and the general *rationale* of warfare, with such unquenchable religious fervour, that one places her apart as a being especially animated by the spirit of God. Indeed, it is as regards this last aspect that we are chiefly concerned, for an adequate explanation of Joan's achievements can only thus be found.

As a little child Joan was noted for her pure and unselfish nature. She did not indulge in the coarse pastimes of her companions, but was employed in helping her mother in household work, sewing, knitting, and visiting sick friends. Remarkable incidents are cited illustrating her courage. At one time a madman, kept bound in a cage because of his violence, broke loose, and obtaining possession of an ax, was savagely approaching a group of villagers, amongst whom was Joan. Everyone fled, and what was the horror of a few who, looking back, saw Joan standing alone, facing the raging maniac. He approached her stealthily, ax raised, and eyes aflame. Joan, undaunted, looked him straight in the eyes, and he stopped, slowly lowering the ax. A minute later the girl led him back to his cage, the ax safe in her

own possession, and he following as docile as a child. The incident is a beautiful one, but its veracity cannot be depended upon. Whether true or not, Joan's whole life at this period proves that she possessed attributes lacked by the ordinary run of mankind.

The first great change in Joan's life came before she was fourteen. One day, while walking in her father's garden, a bright light shone on her right, and out of this light came a voice, which said, "*Jeanne, sois bonne et sage enfant; va souvent à l'église.*" Joan, be good! What more could an archangel, what less could her mother say? But coming in such a manner and to such a child, these simple words conveyed a deeper meaning and Joan redoubled her devotional exercises. The chief change, however, was in her attitude of mind. She no longer lived the careless life of an immature child, but realized the strangeness of her position, and gravely determined to fortify herself. This period of preparation and training lasted about four years; Joan seeing visions and receiving instructions almost daily. These "Voices," as she called them, continued to instruct her in right living and thinking, and gradually commenced to instil in her, also, a supreme pity for France, which soon increased to a passion. So we see that from the start the Voices were preparing Joan for her future mission, not only for her military career, but for her spiritual life as well.

In these Voices is to be found the core of her religious experiences, so for a proper understanding of them, her Voices must be carefully considered. The writer's own opinion about them is that they were direct and personal communications from the Lodge to Joan of Arc, and this is based on two main reasons. First, it is obvious, as the results show, that the English should no longer keep a hold on France; and as France was completely disorganized and dispirited, the Lodge had to employ a special agent to accomplish the work of regeneration. Secondly, Joan of Arc showed in her life and martyrdom the unmistakable signs that all Lodge workers do show. She spent the first few years of her life in meditation and prayer; she went forth into the world and accomplished her appointed task, was captured by her enemies, and suffered a violent death at their hands. But, throughout this course of events, favourable and unfavourable alike, she was guided by her indomitable will, and a supreme faith in the celestial revelations that she received. What other conclusion can we reach, since her life, so guided, was only for good, than that these sources of inspiration came from the highest source, through the agency of all true spirituality.

Looked at in this light, a description of these Voices, together with certain of their utterances, will have an altogether different significance from that usually attributed to them. Joan's own expla-

nation leaves no doubt in the mind of the reader that these revelations were not the creations of a distorted brain, but rather that they existed for her as living realities, to be expected in the course of daily events, and to be counted upon in case of emergency. Any disbelief or curiosity on the part of her enemies only awakened in her a sense of bewilderment. Why cannot you understand; it is perfectly simple and natural? When, during her trial, the judges required a minute description of them, she said that they appeared to her as angels of God, oftenest St. Catherine and St. Margaret. Their approach was always heralded by a brilliant white light, and frequently hosts of other angels accompanied them. They were robed in long white garments, and were crowned with beautiful crowns, very rich and precious. With them, the salvation of her soul was far more important than the next political or military step, and they assured her that if she saw to the righteousness of her actions, the rest would take care of itself. If any doubt arose in her mind as to some course of action, she immediately called on these celestial advisers, and they invariably responding, directed her every more. They frequently foretold events, which Joan repeated to her companions, and which history asserts as true. The whole trend of their teaching was self-abnegation; and, if Joan made serious mistakes, or disregarded their commands (and on several occasions she did so), they always required her to pray first, and make her peace with God, before she could expect further guidance from them.

The question may be raised here as to why these Voices of Joan manifested themselves in the manner they did. Thomas A' Kempis, in speaking of the manifold ways that our Lord reaches different peoples, says, "But to some men I speak common things, to others things uncommon; to some I appear sweetly by signs and figures, but to some I reveal mysteries with much light." It should be remembered also that with the inherited and ingrained faith that the Catholic Religion instils, revelations of another kind would have been condemned by her as coming from the devil, and correspondingly disregarded. On this point, too, the following quotation may shed some light. One of the Masters, in a letter in *The Occult World*, is answering a question regarding the "presumed failure of the Fraternity to leave any mark upon the history of the world. They ought . . . to have been able, with their extraordinary advantages, to have 'gathered into their schools a considerable portion of the more enlightened minds of every race.'" He answers, "How do you know they have made no such mark? Are you acquainted with their efforts, successes, and failures? . . . What they have done, they know; all that those outside their circle could perceive was results, the causes of which were masked from view. To account for these results, men

have, in different ages, invented theories of the interposition of gods, special providences, fates, the benign or hostile influence of the stars. *There never was a time within or before the so-called historical period when our predecessors were not moulding events and 'making history,'* the facts of which were subsequently and invariably distorted by historians to suit contemporary prejudices. *Are you quite sure that the visible heroic figures in the successive dramas were not often but their puppets?* We never pretended to be able to draw nations in the mass to this or that crisis in spite of the general drift of the world's cosmic relations. The cycles must run their rounds, . . . And we, borne along on the mighty tide, *can only modify and direct some of its minor currents.*" Is not Joan of Arc one of these "heroic figures" who are the "puppets" of the Fraternity or Lodge? If this be the case, then these Voices of Joan's are easily explained, for surely the Masters would never leave unguided one of their faithful workers.

Returning now to the life of Joan, many of the inexplicable events during her career will be inexplicable no longer. We all know how she left her peaceful home, her parents, her early ties, and journeyed to Vaucouleurs to demand of the governor men to escort her to the Dauphin's Court; of how he first refused and scoffed at her, but was finally won over by her prophesying nine days in advance that the French would suffer defeat at the Battle of the Herrings; of how she fought her way through the enemy's country; and finally, how she gained prominence and authority by her mysterious recognition of the disguised Dauphin at Chinon. Through all these incidents Joan's great faith in her mission supported her; for the obstacles to be overcome and the adverse conditions to be controlled would have greatly tried the ability of an experienced general, still more the ignorance of a peasant girl not yet eighteen. We all know also how Joan raised and trained an army under terrible difficulties, leading them successfully to the relief of Orleans, where the best generals of France had failed. Here again, the beauty of Joan's spirit is evident, for, unaffected by the acclamations of the multitude, she sought her Prince, and when he offered any reward that she would name, she asked only for permission to march at once to Rheims, so that her beloved Dauphin might there receive the crown which was his God-given heritage. When, finally, through her labour and suffering, he was crowned, and Joan was again offered "whatsoever grace you ask, it shall be granted, though it make the kingdom poor to meet it," what did the maid reply? "Then, oh gentle king, I pray you give commandment that my village, poor and hard pressed by reason of the war, may have its taxes remitted." The king gladly granted her request, and until the French Revolution, three hundred and sixty

years and more afterwards, that promise was faithfully fulfilled. Few indeed are the characters in history who show a more perfect forgetfulness of self.

We shall make no attempt to recount in detail the events of Joan's marvellous victories. These are too well known by everybody, and, inspired and wonderful as they are, they do not bear so directly on the subject in hand. The period of success in a man's life can surely test his character to the utmost, but the period of decline, failure and trial, brings out the deeply religious side. So the era after the coronation throws Joan's religious life into its truest light. The Maid's great mission was fulfilled: there only remained the torture, the passion, that should anticipate the end. Her subsequent life was one dreamy incertitude. She could hardly believe that she was the same person who had won the many victories. Her very Voices, too, took a new tone, presaging suffering and distress, but promising a glorious release. To the end they never told Joan how this should come about, and she, poor girl, thought that they meant a release from her sufferings, and a return to the happy days at Domremy. For this child was indeed suffering. She had been captured by the English, and put into a black dungeon; constantly chained to the wall, and with brutal goalers perpetually in her presence. After a trial of several months, she was finally given the choice of abjuring or being burnt. The terror of the wicked flames crackling beneath her was too much, and Joan renounced her revelations as coming from the devil. This retraction lasted but a short while, her Voices telling her that she had sinned, and that she must have patience and courage, so that God could assure the salvation of her soul and give her the promised victory. It was then that Joan of Arc showed the splendid courage that was in her, for with a body overcome with the strain of the months in prison; with a mind still vividly retaining a picture of the stake, the faggots piled around, the eager, dancing, cruel, flames,—above all this rose a spirit firm in its faith in God; and she went to face those flames unfaltering, with forgiveness on her lips, and a depth and calm of soul that no fears could trouble, no torture could disturb.

Thus lived and died that noble child, "the most innocent, the most lovely, the most adorable the ages have produced." Her natural genius, apart from spiritual interposition, has never been excelled by any general or statesman. The adverse conditions with which she dealt and over which she triumphed, would have tried the genius of a trained soldier, but Joan was ignorant, unlettered, and a mere child in years. Hannibal had a trained army, Cæsar had the veterans of Rome at his command, Napoleon had the resources of a France newly inspired with the glory of freedom and liberty, but Joan of Arc had

only the remnants of a broken nation, whose spirit had fled, and whose courage was a thing of the past. But by the strength of her will, by the Divine Light that illuminated her every act, she restored heroism to her soldiers, and infused a new spirit, her spirit, into France, that to this day makes it one of the foremost nations of the world.

* * * * *

From a study of the lives of the great characters or saints, who have lived the same lives and fought the same battles that we have to live and fight, and who, by their superior will and courage, have succeeded where we as yet have failed, comes an echo of their glory, and we are momentarily moved to emulate their great achievements, to put down our lower natures that bind us to this existence and rise to the heights that we feel to be our heritage. After this fleeting vision, we descend again to the plodding monotony of daily events, and feel, with a passing regret, perhaps, that these exalted beings are too far beyond our field of attainment, and the path they have trod has too many thorns and too little of the rose; that the attempt of which we had dreamed was in very truth a dream, and not the reality we so fondly wish it to have been. The life and experiences of Joan of Arc have, in this respect, always seemed to me an exception, for one does not think of her in the same light as the other saints, whose mighty wills and lofty ideals leave this common mundane life far behind. One thinks of her rather as a girl, pure, sweet, serene; guided by her Divine Spirits as the sunbeams guide a fragile water-lily up through the turbid waters. She had to fight against the scorn of this world while still a little child, for those around her said that she was crazy, and her companions mocked her every look. The battles that she fought were just as material and just as difficult to overcome as the daily problems that confront us. If her Voices guided her faltering footsteps, our consciences supply the selfsame needs. In her we can perhaps find a realistic ideal, that will stimulate us to do and not to dream; to make a spiritual reality where before only existed an intellectual conception. As she fought and conquered through faith, let us fight and conquer through faith; and this faith can only be realized through an effort of will, which all of us at any time can make.

A. G.

ON THE SCREEN OF TIME.

AERIAL NAVIGATION.

COUNT ZEPPELIN'S recent achievement in having navigated the air for over twelve hours consecutively, is really epoch making.

According to occult tradition, however, airships cannot be regarded as a new invention. Aerial navigation is the revival of a very ancient science. The Atlanteans perfected it, long before the days of Egypt's glory. For we have passed the acme of purely material development and of purely material knowledge. We are on the ascent towards the more spiritual planes. In other words, involution, not evolution, is the law which now governs human progress. This means that we are again passing through the stages of our descent into matter, repeating earlier experiences, though with greater self-consciousness and with added moral perception. We may expect, therefore, to recover, as a race, first the control over physical matter, and finally the spiritual "child-state" we have lost. In that sense, Count Zeppelin's invention is a step towards the re-discovery of a forgotten science.

This theory of cyclic progress is of the greatest importance in the occult philosophy. It bears directly upon most of our problems, social as well as personal; and is worthy of much closer study than we usually give it.

Specifically, in the case of aerial navigation, there is popular as well as esoteric tradition to confirm the theory of cyclic revival. In the *Mahabharata* mention is made of "Viwân Vidya," of the "knowledge of flying in air-vehicles," as having been practised in pre-Vedic times; and Mr. Johnston informs us that the *Katha Farit Fagara*, a Sanscrit work dating back about a thousand years, but consisting of very much older stories, re-told, is full of allusions to air-ships, and to hair-raising adventures in them which would make our modern navigators envious.

But it is well to remember also that on strictly philosophical grounds, Herbert Spencer argued in his *First Principles* that "rhythm is a necessary characteristic of all motion" ("The Rhythm of Motion," Chapter X, p. 271). "Apparently," says Spencer, "the universally-coexistent forces of attraction and repulsion, which, as we have seen, necessitate rhythm in all minor changes throughout the universe, also necessitate rhythm in the totality of its changes—produce now an immeasurable period during which, the attractive forces predomi-

nating, cause universal concentration, and then an immeasurable period, during which, the repulsive forces predominating, cause universal diffusion—alternate eras of Evolution and Dissolution. And thus there is suggested the conception of a past during which there have been successive Evolutions analogous to that which is now going on; and a future during which successive other such Evolutions may go on—ever the same in principle but never the same in concrete result” (“Dissolution,” Chapter XXIII, p. 537).

Very crudely, the process may be compared with the ascent of a spiral, such as a corkscrew. Feuerbach, Nietzsche and others, made the mistake of supposing that history must repeat itself exactly; that the reaction must be direct, and forever on the same plane. But Spencer anticipated Nietzsche’s pessimism by pointing out that “a truly rectilinear rhythm can arise only when the opposing forces are in exactly the same line; and the probabilities against this are infinitely great.” While, “to generate a perfectly circular rhythm, the two forces concerned must be exactly at right angles to each other, and must have exactly a certain ratio; and against this the probabilities are likewise infinitely great. All other proportions and directions of the two forces will produce an ellipse of greater or less eccentricity. And when, as indeed always happens, above two forces are engaged, the curve described must be more complex, and cannot exactly repeat itself. So that in fact throughout nature, this action and reaction of forces never brings about a complete return to a previous state” (p. 255).

Remembering that besides the primary rhythms there must be double, triple, and even quadruple rhythms, with reactions taking place as part of a general advance, the view that the broad facts of history are repeated, though always on a relatively higher plane, is strictly in accordance with all that we know of the methods of nature as a whole. We need not scorn, therefore, the statement of the *Mahabharata*, nor attempt to explain it away, as some have done, as the imaginative glorification of his ancestors by some primitive Hindu poet. It would be at least as reasonable, in our opinion, to attribute to that primitive Hindu some clairvoyant pre-vision of the present.

WAR AND THE THIRD DIMENSION.

The achievement of Count Zeppelin suggests more than the revival of an ancient art or science. It reminds us that although we, as a race, function ordinarily in a world of three dimensions, warfare, within the historical period, has been carried on almost exclusively in a world of two dimensions. We fight in “Flatland.”

It was towards the end of the seventies that Zöllner, professor of

astronomy at the university of Leipzig, conducted experiments with Slade, the American medium, which, in his estimation, confirmed practically the theory of a fourth dimension of space, which mathematicians had for long entertained theoretically, and which they had used as a convenience in mathematical demonstrations. Following the publication by Zöllner of his *Transcendental Physics*, a number of books were written, dealing with the same subject in more popular form, the best known among them being *Erehwon*, and an entertaining little brochure called *Flatland*, by "A Square"—otherwise known as Edwin Abbott.

"Flatland" described the experience of A Square who lived in a world of two dimensions, but who gained some knowledge of a world of one dimension, and later of Spaceland, our own world of three dimensions.

In Flatland, although the inhabitants consisted of triangles and squares and hexagons and circles and other figures, if it had not been for certain differences which they learned slowly to recognize, they would have appeared to each other as straight lines only. For in a world of two dimensions there can be no "up" or "down," no "top" or "bottom"; there can be only length and breadth. Thus, if we place a coin on a table, and look down upon it, its appearance will be circular; but this is to look at it from a third dimension, unknown in Flatland. To realize the Flatlanders' limitations, we must lower our eyes to the level of the table's surface, when we shall find circles and triangles and squares reduced to so many straight lines of different lengths.

When our Square had a vision of Lineland, or the world of one dimension, he found nothing but a vast multitude of small Straight Lines, all moving to and fro in one and the same Straight Line. In his own world of Flatland, squares and triangles and circles had been able to move round one another and approach each other at different angles, though always on the same surface. In Lineland, he found that there was no "round"; no point of contact except "end on." When he approached what *he* called the "side" of a Line, he found that to the Line itself this side meant "inside" or stomach. And the moment the Square moved out of line with a Line, *the Square became invisible to that Line.*

Later, an inhabitant from Spaceland, a Sphere, visited our Square in Flatland, and became visible or invisible to the Square, merely by raising or lowering itself above or below the level of the Square's horizon. To the horror of the Square, he found that the Sphere could, to use the language of the Sphere, move through the Square's "solids," and even abstract, without effort, anything enclosed in the Square's idea of

four solid walls. Worst of all, the Sphere could see into the Square's insides!

The Sphere explained to the Square that in order to see into Space of three dimensions he would require an eye, not on his Perimeter, where his was, but on his side, that is, on what he, in the language of Flatland, would probably call his *inside*.

The Square was very slow to understand, and never did wholly understand, except theoretically; but he at last pointed out that by analogy there must also exist a world of four dimensions, from the vantage-ground of which it should be possible to look into the insides of Solid three dimensional things, and to move what we would describe as "through" them. He said to the Sphere: "Doubtless we cannot *see* that other higher Spaceland now, because we have no eye in our insides. But just as there *was* the realm of Flatland, though that poor, puny Line-land Monarch could neither turn to left nor right to discern it, and just as there *was* close at hand, and touching my frame, the land of Three Dimensions, though I, blind, senseless wretch, had no power to touch it, no eye in my interior to discern it, so of a surety there is a Fourth Dimension."

Finally, he appeals to the Sphere to tell him if at some time in the history of Spaceland, Beings of a higher order than those of the three dimensional world have not been known to enter closed rooms, even as the Sphere had entered the house of the Square—without the opening of doors or windows, and appearing and vanishing at will. But the Sphere, while admitting that there have been superstitions to that effect, proves to be by no means tolerant of the suggestion that there can exist any Beings with powers greater than his own, and confesses himself in any case unable to satisfy the scientific curiosity of the Square.

Now in Flatland, as the Square reminds us, though the triangles and squares could jab and even kill one another with the sharp points of their angles, there was of course no possibility of striking from above. And the fact is that in spite of our own race being conscious of and in a world of three dimensions, we have been limited curiously, in warfare, whether by land or sea, to attack and defence on a plane surface. Our aim, even now, is to invent a rifle with the flattest possible trajectory. We manœuvre, we charge, on the same plane as our enemy. The nearest approach to warfare from a third dimension is the use of mortars and siege-artillery; though these are operated, of course, from the same surface as the object they are intended to strike. All we can do, practically, is to jab one another with our angles! At the worst, we are limited to projecting our angles horizontally!

But now comes an airship. We can jab and be jabbed from above. And, following the perfection of the submarine, which enables us to attack from below—the whole science of war becomes anti-

quoted. A new science must be developed from the ruins of the old, and only after long and terrific experience of the new. From a humanitarian standpoint, this may seem lamentable. We should remember, however, that so far scientific discovery has made war less bloody and less brutal than it was. Further than that, scientific discovery has never yet advanced beyond the control of the moral forces. Why should it now? May it not be that the rediscovery of aerial navigation corresponds with some moral development in mankind?

FEMALE SUFFRAGE.

Misdirected energy is always regrettable. Many excellent women in this country and in England have been clamoring for something they will not want if they get it. They have been clamoring so loudly that a scoffing press has named them the Shrieking Sisterhood. We deplore the occasion for the epithet.

Woman's suffrage has been a miserable failure in those of the western states where it has become law. At the first election after the suffrage was granted, numbers of women voted. But after the experience had ceased to be novel, they gradually ceased to vote. There are still some "female politicians"—a noisome brood, who live on "jobs," and whose stock in trade is flattery of county chairmen. These chairmen, for the most part, become epitomes of cynicism, inclined to classify their admirers as "them sort," and to regard all women with ill-disguised suspicion. Of actual influence or "pull," these women have none. When they do get some small job, it is due to good-natured pity. But in the long run they are worse off with it than without it; because the employment is not permanent, and they learn nothing as clerks in a State capital which will help them to earn an honest living afterwards. They redouble their doses of flattery, and succeed only in compelling their benefactors to hide from them.

The votes of these women, the "professional" politicians, of course count for little. Other women who vote are the few elect, whose conscience drives them to it (the very few), and, at the other pole, the unfortunate class who are herded together by the police, driven to the polls, and ordered to record their votes for the party favored by the "Chief."

But apart from the actual result, the principle itself is wrong. To speak of "woman's true sphere" annoys the suffragette, who insists that she is at least as good as a man, and probably better. But that woman has her own sphere, and that she abandons this when she flings herself into the political arena, is undeniable. At no time in the history of the world has woman's influence been greater than among the old Northmen; and then she was prophetess and household goddess—not an Amazon;

not even taking part in the councils of men; but consulted by them reverently, as mother or wife or sister, in the home. The same function is performed by women to-day in India, though to a less degree, Mohametan example having, perhaps, helped to pervert the more ancient practices.

What a woman can be is an inspiration to the men of her acquaintance. She can stand for the more spiritual side of life. Her mind is more clairvoyant than the masculine mind; her intuition is less impeded. A woman, even, whose moral character makes it impossible for the soul to impress her mind intuitively, is likely to have instincts which are very much truer than those of the ordinary man. And all of these faculties and functions are endangered by departure from her own less active sphere into the confusions of competitive life. Her organism, no doubt, would in time adapt itself to new conditions; but the resulting loss would be felt by herself as seriously as by men and by future generations. Material competition is not conducive to the development of the finer feminine qualities.

It has been objected that because modern conditions make it necessary for many women to compete commercially with men, it is only fair that they should be allowed to do so politically as well. But this is to argue that two wrongs can make one right. That some women should have to compete with men is bad enough; but we need not make things worse by extending the field of the competition or by increasing the number of the competitors.

Reincarnation of course balances the account. The "inequalities" are apparent rather than real. And in any case we shall gain nothing by levelling down the whole human race to a commoner norm than is necessary.

MECHANICS OR CONSCIOUSNESS.

Biologists who insist upon defining life as a mechanical process, and who attempt to explain all biological phenomena along the lines of a physico-chemical or mechanistic analysis, have been obliged to admit frankly that there is one more occurrence for which they cannot account, and that is for the curious regeneration of the eye in the tadpoles of salamanders.

If the lens from the eye of a young salamander be removed, the animal proceeds to manufacture a new one, and the eye soon becomes as perfect as it was before. But the trouble is that it performs this miracle in a wholly heterodox and unconventional way. It refuses to conform to the requirements of the mechanical theory. And this naturally disturbs the defenders of that theory. For the new lens is not formed in the same manner or out of the same material as the old.

"In the normal development of the tadpole from the egg, as in all

other vertebrate animals, the lens is formed from the outer skin or ectoderm of the head. In the replacement of the lens after removal, it arises from the cells of the iris which form the edge of the optic cup, and this originates in the embryo, not from the outer skin, but as an outgrowth from the brain."

Now so far as is known, none of the ancestors of the young salamander have had any such habit; nor has the young salamander itself had any previous experience of the process. How then can the power adhere in the structure of the organism? Can it be due to some sort of volition—can the physical effect be the result of some psychic cause? Can it be that there is a connection between this biological phenomenon and the equally inexplicable phenomena of birth-marks and pre-natal impressions?

According to Professor Wilson of Columbia University, it would be unjustifiable to abandon the mechanical theory (although that is not, as he says, fully established), and to adopt a neo-vitalistic or psychic theory in its place, because to do so would land the biologist in the domain of metaphysics or even of faith. But to the mere outsider, who looks on and admires, but occasionally wonders, it is difficult to distinguish between the amount of faith required to adhere any longer to the mechanical theory, and the amount required to accept some hypothesis which admits the psychic factor.

Orthodox biologists still profess to scorn the views of men like Alfred Binet, in his *Psychic Life of Micro-Organisms*; but, after all, they are looking for the truth, and the facts come pouring in, year by year, so overwhelmingly, that we may yet hear of Professor Wilson rivaling Empedocles with some treatise on the Psychology of an Amœba, or on the Loves and Hatreds of a Protoplasmic Cell.

T.

"At the foot of some colossal masonry a man was singing. He sat where the temple wall abutted upon the narrow, crowded roadway. A buttress pillowed his head. The stones of the roadway were his seat. The crowd jostled and pressed him. Yet he sang as the lark sings when it enters the sunlit cloud. The day fell. Night and the stars came out. Still the singer sang. One asked him: 'Art thou not for home?'

"'I have no home.'

"'Hast thou no wherewithal to house and clothe and feed thee?'

"'I have,' said he, 'the Spirit of my song.'" BOOK OF ITEMS.



ELEMENTARY ARTICLES

IV.

THEOSOPHY AND THE PROBLEM OF POVERTY.

DEAR FRIEND: Near to the problem of the family lies the problem of poverty. For every family that is rich there are a thousand that are poor, and some that are very poor.

No one who comes in contact with poverty that is squalid can help but be oppressed by it, and the saddest of all is the poverty that strikes the children, the little ones.

Some of this poverty we may call racial because it seems to be the fate of the race, and those who are born in those conditions seem doomed to life-long poverty. Take as an instance the "Black Belt" of Alabama and other parts of the South, as well as the Negro quarters of our great cities.

Anyone who is acquainted with the actual condition of things in these places will say that a good deal of poverty that we know is wealth compared with the abject poverty of these peoples. A man must be of a most optimistic spirit to believe that there is a solution of the problem. The same is true in almost as large a degree of the two millions of poor whites or "Tackeys," who live in the mountains of Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, West Virginia and the Carolinas. Descendants of brave and noble ancestors, Scotch-Irish, and Huguenot, it is astonishing that such a race could sink to such a depth of ignorance and shiftlessness. True, the land is stoney and hilly, but it is so good that it will raise corn which is the chief product. As they use no machinery for either planting, cultivating or reaping it takes the whole family to manage a small farm. They have generally large families but live in log cabins that have seldom more than one room, and are generally without windows. In this room you will find a home-made table, a few splint bottom chairs, perhaps a bench and two or three beds. They seldom have a stove but cook by a fire-place; "hog and hominy" and the "corn dodger" form the staple of their diet. Fruit grows luxuriously if planted and given a little care, but you seldom see any, for they are satisfied with what grows wild. Money they seldom see, the father of a large family recently told a

missionary teacher that he seldom had two dollars at one time and he did not remember ever having more.

The condition of the Indians is much better because they are wards of the United States Government, still there is deep poverty and great wretchedness among the different tribes.

Not only is there a poverty of race, there is also a poverty of class. When we turn to what we are pleased to call our great centers of civilization, London, New York, Chicago and in many of our smaller cities to some extent, we find a poverty that is simply appalling.

In these cities we find a part in which the streets are narrow and dirty, with junkshops, saloons, stables and queer looking stores. Perhaps the houses were once the homes of well-to-do tradesmen, but now many families occupy one house, and quite often one family in each room.

In this year of grace, 1908, a sister in one day in a Christian city, visited fourteen of these homes in which every room was rented to a different family. In many cases this room had to serve not only as kitchen and bedroom but also as workshop. Here they sleep, wash, cook (when they have anything to cook), and make our collars, blouses, toys and other things that we buy *cheap*. This is not an uncommon picture, for in some cities there are miles of these poverty stricken streets, dirty, stuffy courts and alleys where families crowd into these one-room and two-room homes. Sometimes they are in attics, sometimes in damp basements, and quite often empty of anything that we would call furniture. Here there are hundreds of pale-faced children, half dressed in cold weather. Worse still, there are many lying crippled, paralyzed, helpless or diseased, a filthy mattress, a heap of rags, or a bundle of hay serving as a bed in an otherwise bare cold room. Those of us who occasionally have to go there see heartbreaking poverty that is hidden from the public gaze. Here are children neglected, half-starved, ill-treated, with few joys and many sorrows, few kisses and many blows. It does seem as if life for the slum child is dark and sad, all cloud and little if any sunshine.

Take a case like this (and nothing I am writing you is fiction, it is from real life): here is a family living in two rooms, father, who is out of work, and six children. The mother is in the hospital sick, and here is the baby six months old dying of starvation. In the same block on the top floor are two small rooms, occupied by father, mother and eight children, the eldest being a cripple unable to walk. During the hot weather the baby dies and the coffin containing the body of the dead child stayed in the same room where the cripple and the other children lived and slept, part of a day and all night.

Here is vice, crime and misery that make the heart ache—it is

hardly possible to be good under these conditions. Here in my own city within three or four blocks of the University and Capital building we found last winter a family of immigrants, father, mother and seven children in one room, and the father helplessly drunk. To exist without labor, to eat the bread of idleness, to drink until intoxicated, is the ideal of happiness that many of these people think it is worth an effort to reach. But there are still other phases of poverty that present their problems. Here is a man who has worked hard for years to keep a growing family of girls. He has saved a little money and makes a payment on a lot in a new suburb, gets some bricks and lumber, and builds a "*shack*." Before it is finished winter begins, but to save rent, and to be able to work on his home he moves his family in. Then rheumatism disables him and every cent he has left goes to doctors in the hope of a cure—which does not come. The wife (far from strong) gets some work washing and scrubbing, but not enough to keep them. The burden is heavy, the hope long cherished of a home of his own is blasted. A Christian minister finds him (for he did not go to church) and secures food, clothing and fuel to carry them through the winter and help to get them back to friends, but with little hope for the future. This is a type of hundreds of other cases.

There is another kind of poverty that we call feeble-mindedness, which in turn is the cause of a good deal of physical poverty. Those of us who are connected with charity organizations know some of the greatness of the problem in this aspect. One to whom the subject is new is greatly astonished when told that there are hundreds of thousands of these poor in the United States, and some philanthropists are giving a great deal of time to the study of this problem.

This is a very brief and imperfect statement of the problem, and those who know will say that the picture is much darker than I have painted it.

The great question for us is, Does Theosophy as a philosophy throw any light on the problem? as the Wisdom Religion does it give us any help in the solution? Countless theories have been advanced to account for the existence of the problem, and scheme after scheme has been proposed for the solution. But none of these so far as I know are satisfactory. The Divine Providence theory given to some of us in early life and still widely preached never satisfied even the youthful mind. When we were taught to sing:

"The rich man in his castle,
The poor man at his gate,
God made them high and lowly,
And ordered their estate."

We could not help but wonder why our father was the "poor man at

his gate" and the other boy's father was the "rich man in his castle." And that childish wonder was never satisfied until we met with the explanation given by Theosophy.

The very newest theory, that given by the "New Thought" people, is just as unsatisfactory. They say poverty is a disease and can be cured. Their remedy can only be applied in a few cases and, alone, is not entirely successful, but even if it was a success there still remains the unanswered question, why are so many thousands of innocent babes born in deepest poverty and by their environment apparently condemned to life-long poverty and misery?

It is coming to be a universal belief that perfect justice rules the world, but apart from Theosophy there is no philosophy that explains how this widespread poverty and misery harmonizes with that belief. Heredity, say some, is the cause of poverty, but how to reconcile this theory of the cause with the general belief about a just God and a wise Providence is a most perplexing problem. The law enunciated by Theosophy that "Actions make environment" throws a flood of light on the dark problem. But then another question presents itself, when and where did these little children perform the actions that resulted in this slum environment? When did they think the thoughts that built up the character suited to this environment? The reply is, of course, in former lives, for this is not their first appearance on earth. The thoughts, desires, and actions of those former lives are seeds that are bearing fruit to-day.

"My brothers, each man's life
The outcome of his former living is;
The bygone wrongs bring forth sorrows and woes,
The bygone right breeds bliss. . . ."

This is the doctrine of Karma. This is the teaching of the New Testament, too. "Be not deceived, God is not mocked, for whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap." In former lives we are related to certain people, our actions affected them and their actions affected us, and in the present life the results of these actions appear.

If a child is born deformed the seed of that deformity was sown in a former life by the child and by the parents who gave it birth, so that both reap the exact consequences of former thoughts and acts. This seems to be a perfect explanation of the misery and suffering, the happiness and success of individuals and nations. William Q. Judge says (*Ocean of Theosophy*, page 97), "Individual unhappiness in any life is thus explained: (a) It is punishment for evil done in past lives; or (b) it is discipline taken up by the Ego for the purpose of eliminating defects or acquiring fortitude and sympathy. When defects are eliminated it is like removing the obstruction in an irrigating

canal which then lets the water flow on. Happiness is explained the same way: the result of prior lives of goodness." Perhaps at first this working out of Karma may seem like fatalism; that if we are thus limited by environment we are but helpless slaves of destiny. A little careful thought will enable us to see that we may use this law to control our destiny and thus prove our freedom. We are limited now by our past thinking, by our mistaken choices, our wasted opportunities and foolish desires. We have bound ourselves and we can create a future of liberty. If our thoughts and desires in the past have built our present characters and given us our present tendencies and capacities, and our past actions have made our present environment, the same good law is still working. If our aspirations be lofty and our thoughts pure, then our future characters will correspond. If our actions be good and we render service as far as our opportunity will allow, our future environment will correspond and we shall find ourselves in a position where opportunities for helpfulness and happiness are much greater than we at present enjoy. Thus our present bonds and limitations will melt away, and gradually we shall find ourselves coming into possession of knowledge that will enable us to get rid of the Karma of the past. That is, we shall learn how to use Karmic force to effect Karmic results and so "conquer nature by obedience."

Thus does our philosophy illumine this dark problem and shows us that necessity and freewill are harmonious realities, and that while justice rules the world there is mercy at the heart of all.

And now another question rises, Shall we allow the good law to work itself out alone, or shall we interfere with the Karma of those who are bearing this great burden of poverty by helping them out of it? If we may help, how may we help? Personally I have no fear of interfering with the Karma of those who are in need, for it may be my Karma to step in at this point and render service. Whether this be so or not, we know that the heart of Theosophy is brotherhood, and brotherhood means compassion and service. To be a carrier of light, a messenger of compassion, to help lift the heavy burden of the world and hasten its evolution, should be the ideal life for every Theosophist. It is this life of compassion that brings us into sympathy and companionship with the saviors of the world, for they are all like Him of whom it was said "He came not to be ministered unto but to minister and give his life for others." In the parable of the sheep and the goats, Jesus gave us the standard of judgment, "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye did it unto me."

When the spirit of Theosophy takes possession of us we want to be saviors of the world, and we are impelled to go out "to seek and save that which is lost." Who can look out upon the masses of humanity

in the Orient and the Occident, starving, miserable, ignorant and sick, without being stirred by a great longing to help them? The lowest form of help is help to relieve bodily hunger, but this is often necessary. The best way to relieve a man is to develop him so that he will need no relief, or to raise higher and higher the help he demands. We must seek to enlighten their ignorance, awaken their minds, urge them to take up their cross and restrain appetites and passions, quicken their consciences, and teach them how to improve their outward conditions by developing their inward life. We must seek to awaken in them the capacity for good things, industry, frugality, purity, morality and kindness, thus lifting them into a higher realm of life where they will find a power that will take away all the poverty that needs to be taken away. The poor need intellectual and moral culture, for ignorance enslaves men, and those who live in animalism live at the bottom, while knowledge with moral purity and strength create liberty and wealth. If we could set men free from laziness, ignorance, passion and self-indulgence we would set their feet in the way of prosperity. It is strength and not weakness that rises. This is the Theosophical gospel for the poor and if we can only patiently live our gospel—a gospel of compassion and helpfulness—we shall do a great deal to lighten the burden of poverty and increase the happiness and prosperity of our fellow men.

Faternally yours,

JOHN SCHOFIELD.

"We are sons of yesterday, not of the morning. The past is our mortal mother, no dead thing. Our future constantly reflects her to the soul. Nor is it ever the new man of to-day which grasps his fortune, good or ill. We are pushed to it by the hundreds of days we have buried, eager ghosts. And if you have not the habit of taking counsel with them, you are but an instrument in their hands."

GEORGE MEREDITH.



REVIEWS

The New Old Healing, by Henry Wood (Lothrop, Lee & Shepard Co., Boston). Mr. Wood is a veteran writer upon the philosophy of psycho-therapeutics in general, and his former works have passed through from three to thirteen editions each. Eddyistically speaking, he is a heretic, and should be placed upon the Index. He recognizes the reality of magnetism. He admits, even, that in addition to the mental gymnastics which he recommends (concentration on this or that organ in order to promote circulation and "renewal")—some physical manipulation of the part "may often profitably supplement the mental effort in order to loosen accumulated waste-products in the system and facilitate their removal." This is shocking! Physical manipulation! Still, he preserves enough of the ritual to be able to claim close kinship. "'Thy whole body shall be full of light.' Think of the physical body as bright and almost transparent, instead of heavy and opaque. . . . My (naming section or organ) is good and true. My subconscious mind is active in restoration and in excluding worn-out material [we suggest some gentle rubbing at this point to supplement the process]. My whole force of healing power is concentrated upon this organ. My members all unite in a hymn of divine praise"—and so forth. On the whole, we prefer undiluted Eddyism. To declare that my liver, or other "section or organ," is "good and true," when it isn't and I simply want it to be, is just a trifle less veracious than to declare that the said "section" is imaginary, and that nothing exists but "Good." And apart from veracity, why not swallow the camel and have done with it?

T.

The Mysterious Forces of Nature, by Camille Flammarion. The chapters of this new work of the great astronomer appeared last year in the popular French magazine, *La Revue*, running through a dozen numbers. The book is, therefore, a "sign of the times," like the popular articles appearing in *Everybody's Magazine*, *Harper's Magazine*, *Harper's Weekly*, and even *The Delineator*, which is turning from frills and furbelows to clairvoyance and telepathic communication with the dead. Nothing more remarkable than this popular outburst of interest in things psychical, could well be imagined. Let us hope that it will be turned into useful channels. Camille Flammarion adds little to our knowledge of psychical facts and laws. The real value of his work, it seems to us, lies not so much in his records of his own experiments with the famous Eusapia Paladino and other mediums, as in the fact that he courageously takes up the cudgels for the earlier experiments of Sir William Crookes, A. R. Wallace and others, who did such good work half a century ago and who were subjected to wholly undeserved ridicule, as amiable maniacs, by an age more ignorant than our own. This tardy vindication fills us with satisfaction. Even more interesting, because having a bearing on certain facts that lie nearer to our hearts, is the passage in which the

great French scientist most justly condemns certain "Cambridge experimenters," who, in their large conceit, declared to the world that Eusapia Paladino's phenomena were wholly fraudulent. Their reason was, because they detected her moving her hand and withdrawing it from the magnetic chain. Flammarion shows that the authentic character of the Italian woman's powers is beyond dispute, and that she often raises her hand to her head, which throbs feverishly while the astral manifestations are going on. This simple fact misled the "Cambridge experimenters" into a public denunciation of Eusapia Paladino, which was as ignorant as it was unjust. We hope one day to show that H. P. Blavatsky was the victim of denunciation equally unjust and ignorant. This episode is, for the present reviewer, the most interesting thing in a valuable book. C. J.

MAGAZINE LITERATURE.

The International Journal of Ethics for July contains much of interest. A. H. Lloyd, in an article on "The Relation of Righteousness to Brute Facts," makes the admirable point that "When righteousness is able to feel as its own the sins of unrighteousness, real achievement is surely near at hand." The same writer, in the same article, includes a sense of humor among the spiritual faculties—properly, as we believe; urging that it gives "relief in responsibility, not from it; cherishes frailty; feels the success of failure, and enjoys, not less honestly than keenly, the impartiality of nature." W. M. Salter writes on Bernard Shaw. He concludes that "ultimately, Shaw is not at all a pessimist, but rather an audacious optimist." This is not our opinion. Shaw is a Socialist who does not believe in Socialism; a free-thinker who does not believe in free-thought; a critic who does not believe in himself. He has a brilliant intellect which he prostitutes by his contempt for it. Finally, and to depart still further from the generally accepted view, his sense of humor is diseased because he has lost, if he ever possessed, a sense of proportion, and because he knows of nothing true with which to compare the untrue, of nothing real with which to compare the unreal. T.

The Annals of Psychical Science, a double number for June and July, consists for the most part of a long and instructive article by Dr. Henry A. Fotherby on "Music and Emotion." Having, in the November and March issues, traced a physical and psychical relationship between sound and music on the one hand, and form, light and color on the other; and then having suggested reasons for believing that the evolution of the color senses was coincident and associated with the evolution of certain emotions and mental faculties under the pressure of environment, *each color being represented by a corresponding psychic state*—he now completes the circle by demonstrating the relation of music to emotion. His illustrations are all taken from European music, though he would have found even more forceful proof of his thesis if he had gone further afield, either to Asia, or to "savage" music, such as to the war-songs and very brutal love-music of the Maoris. An article by Byramji Hormusji on "Andambar: The Indian Lourdes," gives a record of cases showing that the god Dattâ is responsible for at least as many cures as the famous shrine in France. But Dattâ's methods are peculiar. He is said to appear very frequently to the friends of sufferers, in dreams, and to instruct them how to proceed in order to cure the diseases, particularly cases of "obsession." His image or shrine is described as if it were a dynamo of conscious magnetic

and healing power. The writer describes himself as a Spiritualist. Only incidentally, therefore, does he mention that underground, and quite close to the shrine, there is a temple of the Yoginis, "where it is said fifty yoginis, or female ascetics, sit in eternal samadhi," or contemplation. It evidently does not occur to this Hindu Spiritualist that these Yoginis may have something to do with the phenomena of the shrine. He speaks of Crookes and Flammarion and Richet as if they were gods. But has he studied the scriptures and records of his own people? T.

The Open Court for July contains an article by the Editor on "The Persistence of Symbols," as instanced by the double eagle and the staff of Hermes, which deals with the subject historically, to the total exclusion of the symbolism. It is valuable, however, as a footnote to the *Secret Doctrine*. In another article by the Editor, in comment upon contributions by H. F. Bell and the Rev. A. Kampmeier, he returns to his really interesting hypothesis that Christianity did *not* first go through "the Jewish mold," but that a new religion had for long been developing in the Eastern part of the Roman Empire, of a gnostic character, and that "its main ideas had been worked out to such an extent that St. Paul could use its terms without deeming an explanation of them necessary. . . . St. Paul's rapid success is due mainly to the fact that the leading ideas of the new religion which he preached were already common property among the people whom he addressed. The chief point that was new in his preaching was the proposition that the expected Christ was Jesus." From that point of view, the Baptist was not the only forerunner who prepared the way. The August number succeeds in its aim of being "suited to the hot season." Its pabulum is "light." But there are some articles of a more serious vein which are not lacking in originality of subject and treatment. Particularly interesting is the "Indonesian Legend of Nabi Isa," which is a story of the "Prophet Jesus" retold in the style of the Buddhist Jatakas, and which reached the island of Java through natives and not through Europeans. The story attributes to Jesus the character of a man who in his quiet wisdom and perfect goodness deals justly with other people while they suffer by their own avarice and egotism. "Muhammad, the Founder of Islam," by the Shaikh M. H. Kidwai of Gadia, Barabanki, Oudh, India, is an account of the life of the great Muslim prophet, and also to some extent a characterization of his personality and mission. "The Samaritans" sums up a few interesting features of this sect as related in a recent book by James Alan Montgomery. T.

The Monist for July is not quite up to its usual standard. Dr. Paul Carus, however, contributes an article of interest in criticism of Pragmatism, and incidentally of Mr. Charles S. Peirce's "Tychism," according to which "in the beginning" there was Chance (*Tyche*). Chance is not subject to law. It is free, as Spirit is free. Chance acts arbitrarily, but gradually it took on habits, and habits became more and more solidified and hardened into laws. Hence the order of the universe is not the cause of evolution, but its product. Dr. Carus suspects Professor James of a similar assumption. We should like to know what, in Mr. Peirce's opinion, preceded "in the beginning." Theosophically, of course, that which has a beginning must also have an end. Time, if it is not to cease, can never have begun. To conceive of a beginning, in the absolute sense, is impossible. We cannot agree with Dr. Carus that such a conception—"of the instability of natural laws," based upon such a premise—"is one of the most original and most

ingenious theories ever brought forth." Other articles deal with "Heredity Related to Memory and Instinct;" "The Third Movement of the Earth," and, by the same writer (Pierre Bezian), "Warm Epochs and Glacial Epochs." T.

The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods, for July 2d, 16th, 30th and August 13th, leaves one slightly exhausted. Not to respect such painstaking and minute examination of everything in space, including space itself, would be impossible. But occasionally we wonder whether humanity is going to be benefited by the perpetual analysis of analyses; by the word-chopping of minds so delicately poised, so exquisitely refined, so extraordinarily acute (in their own specialties), that though they act with the precision of a machine in the dissection of all subtleties, they seem to produce little else but a series of intellectual specimens for some collector's cabinet. Take this by way of instance: "How can something not a presentation produce a change in the continuum of presentations?" Now this is magnificent; but is it war? Is it creative and beneficial? Does it carry us nearer to the heart of things; nearer to the dawn? Is it not rather a sort of sublimated dermatology? T.

In *Everybody's Magazine* for September, Hamlin Garland concludes his series on "The Shadow World." The last instalment contains some interesting instances of astral projection. The author himself seems to favor this explanation of the so-called spiritistic phenomena, attributing it to de Rochas, as the "teleplastic" or "ideoplastic" theory. "If the observations of scientific experimentalists are of any value," he says, "the teleplastic theory is on the point of winning acceptance. . . . These apparitions are emanations of the medium's physical [psychical?] substance, molded by his will and colored by the mind of his sitters." "It may be that the etheric double can take on part of the forces resident in the circle of sitters." And Madame Blavatsky, who explained all this as long ago as 1875, still "a fraud"! Having assimilated so much of her teaching, however, it would be worth while to study it more deeply, if only to avoid the error of attributing *all* classes of phenomena to one cause. The effort to exclude the "spirit" factor is healthy and praiseworthy, because few superstitions are more degrading than that which attributes to "spirits" the psychic monstrosities and follies of the séance room. Nevertheless, as the occultists of all ages have explained, there is a radical difference between the soul of man, and the psychic or semi-conscious residue which the soul, after death, leaves behind in the astral world just as it leaves the physical body behind in this world. It is this astral "shell" or residue which may be galvanized into a fictitious life at séances, and which is answerable, with other factors, for some cases of alleged "spirit" identity. Further, as Mr. Garland must admit, there are few sudden jumps or gaps in nature: the lines of demarcation between the mineral and vegetable and animal kingdoms are not marked by chasms. So with the visible and invisible; the solid and gaseous; the natural and the etheric. Why, then, not allow for other orders of intelligence besides those of our daily experience? Why not infer that there must be, or in any case ought to be, creatures in the astral world, perhaps of ape-like mentality; perhaps also with less intelligence than the apes until vivified by contact with the human will—whether the consciously exerted over them or not? Why not realize, in brief, that this rather unclean branch of practical psychology, or of pathopsychology, has been studied for thousands of years, instead of being the discovery of Aksakof, Wallace, Lombroso, Morselli and the others; and that the ancients

may have known very much more about it than we do, who approach all subjects from the outside, along a groove which we have beaten for other purposes, and which has led us away from the metaphysical to the tangible and "valuable."

T.

Bibby's Annual for 1908, which appears in a form similar to that of a Christmas number of the London *Graphic*, but which is printed on better paper and in a more handsome cover, can no longer be classed directly as an advertising periodical. It contains no advertisements. It consists of many beautiful illustrations and of a series of articles, every one of which is theosophical. In fact, it might almost be the publication of some theosophical society. An article by Mr. Charles Johnston is reprinted from the *QUARTERLY*. Other articles deal with "The Path to Peace," "Some Possibilities of Human Consciousness," "The Occultism of To-day—the Mysticism of the Past" (by Mrs. Sinnett), "Good-Will and Happiness" (James Allen), and similar subjects. Mr. Joseph Bibby himself contributes "A Study of Sociology," in which he shows much excellent sense as well as unusual grasp of his subject. Mr. Bibby is not a Socialist. But Mrs. Annie Besant, in an article entitled "The Future Socialism," shows that she has not even yet shaken off some of her earlier misapprehensions. So often, many years ago, did she condemn the hated "capitalist," and attribute all rights to the "proletariat," that she seems unable to see beyond the very narrow horizon of Socialist economics. She says, "Now I believe that the next great stage of civilisation will be Socialistic; that in the centuries that lie before us there will be realized many of the economic conditions, probably all, that the Socialists of the day demand." And it is clear that her wish is father to her thought. We, for our part, hope for something better—for something less likely to injure the great mass of the people and more likely to benefit them. It is true that Mrs. Besant is not consistent. She declares that "a democratic Socialism, controlled by majority votes, guided by numbers, can never succeed; a truly aristocratic Socialism, controlled by duty, guided by wisdom, is the next step upwards in civilisation." But we doubt whether the social question can be solved by a contradiction in terms, such as "aristocratic Socialism" undoubtedly is; and although we agree with the rest of the sentence, we regret that so much that is true should be mixed with so vital a misunderstanding.

T.

Addresses Before the New York State Conference of Religion, June, 1908. "The Conference was organized in 1899 by ministers and laymen of twelve different denominations. Agreeing that individual beliefs should be loyally held and frankly maintained, but also that Religion unites many whom Theology divides, it affirms the unity of the religious spirit in the differing religious organizations, the supremacy of Character and Service as the witnesses of that spirit, and the obligation resting on all men of religious spirit to co-operate for social salvation. Its motto is, '*Religions are many, Religion is one.*'" Among the Executive Committee are such well-known leaders of progressive thought as the Rev. Percy S. Grant and the Rev. T. R. Slicer. The objects of the Conference are most praiseworthy and it is to be hoped that they will be adhered to strictly. In this Report, an address by Dr. Stephen S. Wise, Rabbi of the Free Synagogue, New York, contains much that is inspiring. He makes one curious statement, however, which, during the discussion which followed his address, seems to have been overlooked. "I have often wondered," he said, "whether men have not been overzealous in heeding the word of him who

said that he had many things yet to say, but men could not bear them, but after him would come the Spirit of truth. . . . God suffers man to find the truth not that he may withhold it, but that he may declare it in all its conquering majesty. God never requires the prophet to withhold the truth from men."

Sometimes it seems to us that at least as much harm has been done by the blurring out of truths (or of half-truths) as by the artificial and forcible suppression of truths. The great mass of people at the present time have lost faith in the things which their fathers used to credit, and have nothing to take their place—thanks to the iconoclastic education of the past thirty years. They do not realize that the old "superstitions" are symbols of great truths. They are practically without religion. Half-truths were proclaimed to them before they were ready to receive them. They do not understand science in any of its branches; they merely disbelieve in religion. This is true even of many who attend some church. It is like bringing up children on economics and cutting out fairy stories. Children need fairy stories of one sort or another. In the same way and for similar reasons, there are a great many people who would be much better citizens if they had not lost faith in a lively and unpleasant Hell. The Rabbi seems to forget that too strong or large a dose of anything may kill—even of water, even of the water of life, which is Truth. In another address, delivered by the Rev. G. R. Lunn, tremendous emphasis is laid, as usual, upon "social needs." Social needs—the realization of these is to draw the churches together and is to make Christians of us all, as nothing else will. But does this excellent minister realize that there are spiritual needs also? What does the average, more modern Protestant clergyman mean when he uses the word "Soul"? Does he mean clothes or stomach or proper sanitation or the reorganization of society or a sewing circle? It would be interesting to know. T.

The New Life Magazine, in its first issue, explains that "the New Life believes in the personality of God, the reliability of the Holy Spirit, the power of prayer, and the Deity of Christ." It proposes to unify the churches. It starts out with plenty of self-confidence and much enthusiasm; and to those who like large size capital letters flung at them from the middle of a sentence, it should make a sufficiently striking appeal.

Theosophisches Leben, for June, July and August, contains some excellent original matter as well as translations from the QUARTERLY. Ernst J. Wiederhold, Otto Ziegner, A. Luntowski, Franz Büttner, K. S. Uhlig, Oskar Stoll, and the Editor, make useful contributions, which we, on this side of the water, most cordially welcome. The utmost credit is due to the Editor for his persistent and careful work. The *Theosophisches Leben* deserves a wide circulation in this country among German-reading people. Subscriptions should be sent to Herrn Paul Raatz, Berlin S. W. 48, Wilhelm Str. 120; Germany.

Neue Metaphysische Rundschau, No. 4, gives translations of an article by Ragon on the Mass; by "Papus" on the Tarot; an unpublished letter by de Rochas, and general reviews and notices.

We have also received *The Light of Reason* for August, edited by James Allen and published at Ilfracombe, England, the spirit and tone of which are admirable; *The Theosophic Messenger*; an illustrated catalogue of "The Work of the Open Court Publishing Co.," covering a period of twenty-one years; *Socialism in Brief*, by William L. Garver; and *The Problems and Perils of Socialism*, by J. St. Loe Strachey (Editor of the London *Spectator*), published by the Macmillan Co.

Within the last two or three years four or five Theosophical publications have been sent to us from Russia. They certainly herald the awakening of theosophical thought, not only among elect individuals, as it used to be heretofore, but in much wider and more varied layers of its population. I hear of gatherings of people in Moscow, St. Petersburg, Kaluga, Smolensk, Kieff, who all independently announce their intention of pursuing a regular course of theosophical activities, reading and lecturing. I have before me two Russian theosophical magazines, *Theosophicheskoe Obozrenie* and *Theosophskaya Jizn* (*The Theosophical Review* and *Theosophical Life*).

The latter came into existence a month before the former. So I shall speak of it first.

Its tendency is much more exclusively Christian than the other. And no wonder, for we find members of the Russian clergy among its contributors. Its first article announces the objects of the Theosophical Society of Smolensk, beginning with the quotation, "Love thy neighbor as thyself." And, indeed, from what we can gather from the publication, the objects of that society are rather those of a charitable organization than of a gathering of people whose objects are intellectual study and moral improvement. The members of that society are, among other duties, to waken the conscience in human beings . . . to give out instructions for the strengthening of the spirit . . . to spread ideas of temperance, right living, chastity, etc., . . . to help as much as they can the founding of temperance societies, asylums for the aged and those suffering from alcoholism . . . to found societies which shall supply the poor in winter with warm clothing, food, etc.

This is as far as we can judge the general tone of the Smolensk Theosophical Society.

The second article is by the Archimandrite Alexander, entitled "The Victorious Way of Spiritualism," the latter term implying more the idea of spirituality than anything else.

The article on "Occultism, its substance, growth, and relation to Christianity," is quite a remarkable article, and I am sorry I cannot quote from it here.

The motto of *The Theosophical Review* is more generally theosophical. "There is no religion higher than truth." Its objects, broadly speaking, are ours. The contents of the first number are: A leader, The Brotherhood of Religions, by Annie Besant; What is Theosophy, by Franz Hartmann; Spinoza as a Theosophist, by L. Bogushevsky; A Great Mystery, by F. Morius, and the reports of the various theosophical activities in various countries. Mr. L. Bogushevsky's article deserves notice. Here are a few quotations from it:

"God is not separable from us, we are but forms, as Spinoza says, modes of the Divine Substance. As this substance is manifest to us from its two properties, expansion and thought, so man, who is but a mode of the substance, consists of body (a mode of expansion) and of soul (a mode of thought)."

"Equanimity and peace, and a kindly relation to all men are a direct conse-

quence of following Spinoza's teaching. But first of all it rids man of the fear of death. There is nothing of which a free man thinks less than of death, and his wisdom is not in meditating on death, but on life."

"Spinoza distinguishes between three minds of perception; ordinary perception through disorderly experience or hearsay . . . (*cognitio ab experientia vaga*); scientific perception, when we have general ideas and correct notions of the properties of things (*ratio et secundi generis cognitio*); and intuitive perception (*scientia intuitiva*). This latter leads to the direct reception of truth. . . . In as far as its perceptions are correct, our soul is part of the infinite intelligence of God, and, therefore, the clear and distinct ideas of our soul must be as true as the ideas of God. Therefore the third kind of perception is simply the divine knowledge of God in men, or in other words, THEOSOPHY."

V. J.

Rivista d'Italia. This admirable Italian magazine has the distinction of having printed, in two recent issues, an account of what is decidedly the best single piece of work in psychical research yet recorded. The experimenter is Professor Filippo Bottazzi, professor of physiology in the University of Naples. The subject of the experiments was the now world-renowned Italian woman, Eusapia Paladino. The place was the laboratory of physiology in the Naples University. Professor Bottazzi held eight sittings with Eusapia Paladino, several of his colleagues completing the "circle." A cabinet was prepared by hanging a curtain in front of a closed door to a smaller room, which had no other entrance. Through the door electric wires were led, to automatic recording instruments in the smaller room, and these wires were connected with telegraph keys in the cabinet. The medium never entered the cabinet, however, but sat at a round table, around which the investigators sat, holding hands in a "magnetic circle," which included the medium. The room was dimly lit by electricity throughout.

During the eight sittings, many remarkable phenomena were obtained. Raps were made on the walls of the room. The electric key was pressed, from a distance, a record being automatically made in the other room, chairs and tables were moved from a distance, and the investigators saw and felt "spirit hands" and "spirit faces." But the valuable part of these rigidly conducted experiments lies in the fact that Professor Bottazzi proved to demonstration that all the effects noted were produced by the astral body of the medium, which was apparently able to leave the physical body and move about the room at will, pressing the electric keys, pushing chairs about, and touching the sitters, while the physical body of the medium remained in the circle, in a trance. This corroborates what H. P. Blavatsky taught a quarter of a century ago.

C. J.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

QUESTION 84 (Continued).—*How are we to know that we are on the right Path?*

ANSWER.—When each day and each moment we are doing our whole duty in the light of the best knowledge and faith and effort we can see. CAVE.

ANSWER.—Such a question did Thomas ask of Jesus: "Lord we know not whither thou goest, and how can we know the way?" and Jesus, the Christ, answered, "I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me."

This is in the fourteenth chapter of the Gospel according to St. John—the most mystic of all the gospels, and that which contains the most direct description of the life and journey of the Soul. With it we may compare another rendering of the same teaching.

"Each man is to himself absolutely the way, the truth, and the life. But he is only so when he grasps his whole individuality firmly, and by the force of his awakened spiritual will recognizes this individuality as not himself, but that thing which he has with pain created for his own use, and by means of which he purposes, as his growth slowly develops his intelligence, to reach to the life beyond individuality. When he knows that for this his wonderful complex, separated life exists, then, indeed, and then only, he is upon the way."

And again in the same section: "Seek out the way. Seek the way by retreating within. Seek the way by advancing boldly without. Seek it not by any one road. To each temperament there is one road which seems the most desirable. But the way is not found by devotion alone, by religious contemplation, by ardent progress, by self-sacrificing labour, by studious observation of life. None alone can take the disciple more than one step onward. All steps are necessary to make up the ladder. . . . The whole nature of man must be used wisely by the one who desires to enter the way. . . . Seek it by plunging into the mysterious and glorious depths of your own inmost being. Seek it by testing all experience, by utilizing the senses in order to understand the growth and meaning of individuality, and the beauty and obscurity of those other divine fragments which are struggling side by side with you, and form the race to which you belong. Seek it by study of the laws of being, the laws of nature, the laws of the supernatural: and seek it by making the profound obeisance of the soul to the dim star that burns within. Steadily as you watch or worship, its light will grow stronger. Then you may know you have found the beginning of the way. And when you have found its end, its light will suddenly become the infinite light."

It is clear that this—from *Light on the Path*—is but a restatement and amplification of the words of Christ, speaking as the Logos and the Spirit of Man, in answer to the question of Thomas. What is its meaning to us? Does it answer our question also? Does it give us a guide which we can understand and follow

in our daily living, and by which we will know we are on the Path—"The small old Path that leads to the Eternal?"

Within each of us the Eternal is ever speaking. In the voice of duty, in the mysterious promptings of our conscience, in the call of the ideal, in the power of justice and compassion, we hear and feel its presence. We are bidden to "seek out the way by retreating within." That is, we are told to turn our minds and hearts to this inner movement of the Spirit, and to make before it "the profound obeisance of the Soul." To do so is to place ourselves in the attitude of obedience—to will to follow this inner guidance. Then "steadily as you watch and worship its light will grow stronger." We begin to perceive that this which we had viewed as a guide is also a living power, the power of the Spirit, the cosmic breath of God breathing through the worlds. And though it transcends our separate existence we yet know it to be more truly the Self than all else in us. Then for this greater Self we strive to set aside the lesser. This is the awakening of the spiritual will by which man recognizes his individuality "as not himself but that thing which he has with pain created for his own use" and "by means of which he purposes to reach to the life beyond individuality."

Here is where the second direction, "Seek out the way by advancing boldly without," becomes necessary. This union with the Spirit is not to be a mere attitude of religious devotion, a mere vision of meditation for times of solitude and rest. It is to transfuse and transmute our entire natures. We are no longer to live from our individual separate wills but with this life and power of the Spirit. We all know the power of old habit and custom, so that we say of this or that act that it was not done of our wills but of custom—the past acting in the present. So now not habit, not our past, nor yet our present separate wills are to guide our acts. We are to will to set aside our will and live not from the personality but from the Divine. We are to will not to live ourselves, but to let the Divine live in us, in each act and moment of our lives. As of old, habit and personal desire held us, so now Duty, Justice, Love, the qualities and power of the Divine, are to act in and through all we do. By them we test all experience; in them we find the beauty of "those other divine fragments" which are struggling side by side with us and learn their oneness with ourselves. And so we are not to seek to choose the form of this experience but to accept that into which our duty leads us. "To each temperament there is one road which seems the most desirable." But we are to remember that *all* are necessary and that to turn from our duty to what seems an easier road is, in fact, to turn from the goal we seek.

As we strive to make our own lives embodiments of divine life, we learn that the mystic union of the soul with God is, in truth, the heart and essence of existence. And we recognize that that which we are striving to accomplish in ourselves has been attained by those greater than we. The inspiration and the power which reaches us comes through lives such as we would make our own. We see the double truth of Christ's answer. Each man's Soul is in itself the way, the truth, and the life. But it is so only as the Master lives in that Soul.

Therefore we may know that we are on the right Path when, and only when, our will is firm to say with Paul: "I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me."

M.

QUESTION 86 (Continued).—*How far is one justified in tolerating what one believes to be evil?*

ANSWER.—To the extent that one is unable to remedy it; and remedy does not consist in replacing one evil with another, as many fondly imagine. For instance, the removal of an evil may be the "duty of another," which the Gita tells us is

full of danger. To remedy in such circumstances, is to replace one evil with another. Occultism has one simple answer to all such questions. Do each moment's duty in that moment, with complete, whole-hearted devotion, in calmness and in faith, careless of results. The Good Law provides for the rest. The truth is that our ideas of Good and Evil are so crude we are oftenest wise to go slowly in our reforms, save in *ourselves*. There the field is wide and the opportunity unbounded.

Cavé.

QUESTION 89.—*Is decay antagonistic to growth, or is it necessary to growth?*

ANSWER.—“That which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die: and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain” (I Cor., 15:36-37).

In this excerpt from Paul's epistle to the Corinthians we would seem to have a beautifully simple answer to the question.

There is a belief as old as the world that in every form something of Life is confined. And decay releases the life from the prison of form. The body of the grain dies, but the germ takes a new form and grows.

S.

ANSWER.—Decay is necessary to growth, because all forms are temporary vehicles used by the evolving spirit of life for its varying expression. The expanding soul, in its progress through matter, discards these vehicles as it exhausts their usefulness, and seeks other and higher forms for the unfolding of its inner activities. The forms abandoned by the soul are thus given over to decay, but, if it were not for this, soul would be limited in its evolution, for it would be confined by forms it had outgrown. The tiny atoms, released from their external moulds, are made available for use in other ways, and bear in their inner essence the stamp of that spirit whose higher purpose they have served.

W.

ANSWER.—Decay seems to me a necessary accompaniment of growth in any compound organism. The decay is of that part which has served its purpose and is for the moment no longer needed. Nature cannot stand still. Forms in nature must progress and go on growing in power or function. Those parts of an organism which are no longer needed must be recombined and again used in the progress of the whole organism. The Hindu trinity of Brahma, Vishnu and Siva are the symbols of this in every department of nature, in matter, force and consciousness. Growth, Maintenance and Re-combination for the purposes of further growth are the parts of the perpetual becoming in manifested life. The same agencies which build and grow are those which maintain and those which break up the form of manifestation for the purposes of another cycle of growth and maintenance. These forces and forms are perpetually operative in every department, whether animate or apparently inanimate.

K.

QUESTION 90.—THE THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY has devoted some space to showing that the term “Christian-Socialism” is self-contradictory. Yet I would like to ask if the first Christian communities were not Socialistic, and their ideals of common ownership the same, in principle, as those of the Socialist party to-day?

ANSWER.—At first sight, there is an analogy between the first Christian community and the community proposed by Socialism; yet I think the likeness is only apparent. To begin with, what was the driving power, the directing motive, in the two cases?

In the first Christian community, and even more, in the case of Jesus and His disciples, the motive was an entire renunciation of this world: “My kingdom is not of this world.” “He that hateth his life shall keep it unto life eternal,” and

so on. The purpose of the community was to further entire renunciation of worldly desires, the desires of the body, of family life, of external activities generally; and the purpose of this renunciation was, that the disciples might be "born again," or "born from above," into the "kingdom of heaven," the spiritual world of immortal life, in the presence of "the Father which seeth in secret." The community of Jesus and His disciples renounced not only property but also a local abode, family life and all worldly activity, devoting themselves wholly to the life of the invisible world.

Is there any analogy at all between this ideal and the ideal of the Socialists? Do not the latter propose as their ideal, as their practical motive and driving power, *material* well-being; the production of more comfortable houses, better clothes, richer food, for "the masses"? Is not their whole thought fixed on the visible world, and do they not in fact hold that the *greatest material comfort* of the greatest number is the supreme good? They look forward to an indefinite number of families made materially better off by the more equal division of the products of industry, and their motive, instead of being renunciation of this world, in order to be reborn in the spiritual world, is destruction of the present order of society, in order to secure a new order, in which everyone will have greater material enjoyments and indulgence. Nearly all the Socialists (and this is especially true wherever they are well organized, as in France and Germany), are avowedly materialistic, and would scoff at the idea of Jesus—the rebirth from above, the birth into the spiritual world.

Now, as to the means advocated by Jesus. He always sought to arouse in His followers a genuine love for spiritual life, for the spiritual world, in order that they might, of their own free will, renounce and follow after spiritual life. He never used anything like compulsion or authority, even with His own disciples, not even raising a finger to withhold Judas from betraying Him.

The Socialists, on the other hand, do not believe in free-will. They seek to obtain a majority of votes and thereby to coerce the minority into a certain social order, which will, in fact, be an irresponsible tyranny. They proclaim that "the people" are to govern; but how can a mass of people take any initiative? What they really mean is, that they want the mass of the people to indorse their plan, and to make them in fact dictators and tyrants. This would not only set up the worst despotism the world has ever seen, but would have the effect of stifling and fettering the gifted and creative individuals, and on the free activity of these individuals the progress of the world has always depended.

Therefore I think that, both in the end sought, and in the means proposed, the first Christians and the Socialists are worlds apart, though there may be an external resemblance between them. Is there not this fundamental distinction, that whereas the disciples of Jesus gave up their own possessions, the Socialists wish to compel other people to give up theirs? Is there not here all the difference between renunciation and confiscation? Until the Socialists add to their program celibacy, temperance, abstinence, and entire unworldliness, even to the extent of having no fixed abode, they cannot be compared to the disciples of Jesus. C. J.

VALUABLE TO ALL STUDENTS OF MYSTICISM
FRAGMENTS

By **CAVÉ**

Collected From

**The Path, The Irish Theosophist, The Theosophical
Forum, The Theosophical Quarterly**

With a Preface and Additional Matter by the Author

Cover Design by Birger Elwing

PRICE, 60 CENTS, POSTPAID

Order from the Secretary, T. S., 159 Warren St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

THE FRUIT OF MANY YEARS' STUDY
The Bhagavad Gita

TRANSLATED BY

CHARLES JOHNSTON

A faithful rendering of the spirit and letter of the original, with a general
introduction and an explanatory introduction to each book, seek-
ing to give the Mystical, Religious, Philosophical, Ethical
and Historical aspects of

THE SONGS OF THE MASTER

PRICE, \$1.00

Order from the Secretary, T. S., 159 Warren St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Talks on Religion

By

HENRY BEDINGER MITCHELL

A Reprint, with added Talks, of the important articles contributed to
THE THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY

These TALKS are a faithful report of the discussions of a group of thinkers,
philosophers and students of religion, and shed much light on
the religious problems of to-day

Published by

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., London and New York

PRICE, \$1.50

Order from the Secretary, T. S., 159 Warren St., Brooklyn, N. Y.



The Theosophical Society, as such, is not responsible for any opinion or declaration in this magazine, by whomsoever expressed, unless contained in an official document.

A GENERATION ago, as a result of the splendid discoveries and theories of Charles Darwin, a sharp contest was waged between the advanced adherents of science and the votaries of theology. Bitter word-battles were fought, in which Darwin was denounced as an atheist, which he in no sense was, while the more conservative theologians like the famous Samuel Wilberforce, were targets for the erudite sarcasm of Huxley, who eloquently inveighed against the thunders of the drum ecclesiastic, as he called it. The conflict waged between the giants was taken up by lesser men; and theology and secularism ransacked the archives for dialectic weapons against each other. It was the sharpest concussion of minds and spirits, since the great war between Martin Luther and the powers of Rome.

During that long contest, there was one weapon which the scientific rationalists used with withering sarcasm against the armies of the Church. "What is your Christian morality worth," they said, "when it is based on essential immorality? Is not Justice the high ruler of heaven? Yet your Christian faith sins shamefully against Justice. You say that you have sinned; that in Adam's Fall, we all incurred the wrath of God. We no longer believe in Adam, but you do believe—or say you do. And believing in Adam's sin, which passed to all mankind as a lasting heritage, you say that, to redeem this sin, a greater and graver sin was committed; no less than that flagrant sin against Justice, the punishment of the innocent for the guilty. To redeem sinful man, the Saviour was sacrificed, being Himself innocent, holy, without sin. The innocent One for the guilty many. What darker injustice could be conceived? What graver crime could be chosen as the foundation for righteousness? What more immoral basis for morality?"

It was a bitter taunt, and it was pressed home with relentless, withering sarcasm. Time passed, and by degrees the contest subsided. In part, this was owing to the sweeping victories won by the idea of Evolution, which made it no longer possible for the conservatives to maintain the static principle of special creation. In part it was due to a realization that the principle of Evolution was not of necessity hostile to religion; but that, even within the field of religion, it had a deep significance and promise; that, if there was the evolution of the body, there was not less the evolution of the soul, of the Church, of religious life, of the revelation of God to man: And of late it is becoming daily better understood that the last word of wisdom was not spoken by the Darwinians; that beyond the material realm of the biologist, there may be other realms, equally capable of exact exploration, equally real, and in their reality giving a firm ground for many of the beliefs of religion which were the targets of the sharpest arrows of secularism a generation ago. The tide has turned, and it is certain that the science of the future will declare for the reality of the invisible world, the world of our immortality.

Nevertheless, within Darwin's lifetime, the materialists were completely triumphant. They had traced the history of Life, they said, and "found in Matter the promise and potency of all forms of life," as Tyndall declared in his famous address at Belfast. They affirmed that they would lay bare the sources of Life itself, its very nature and most hidden secrets. And, with the taunt of "the innocent for the guilty" still on their lips, they pressed on their investigations. What history will say of the present "age of science" is uncertain. But one thing is sure: that, if there be any justice and righteousness in the days to come, there will be unmeasured condemnation of one feature of our age, the abominable practice of vivisection.

Experiments on living animals were inaugurated, in all probability, with the aim of penetrating the secrets of Life; and it seems certain that the contest with the theologians, and the wish to disprove God's prerogative of creation, were an added incentive. But the revelation of some of the detestable practices of the vivisectors aroused a general outcry. The new inquisitors no longer dared to say that they inflicted these horrors solely from curiosity, whether or not dignified by the name of scientific. They offered a sop to public opinion, by declaring that they tortured animals, submitting them to abominable mutilations, "for the good of mankind." "The innocent for the guilty."

The secularists taunted the Christians with the sin of injustice. "Your faith is immoral," they said, "because it punishes the innocent for the guilty." But how infinitely worse is their own religion, the accepted "religion of science," at the present moment. On the one hand the belief of theology that, for the spiritual well-being of mankind, for the redemption of innumerable souls, a single victim was offered once, though even in "agony and bloody sweat." On the other, the practice of science, involving innumerable helpless victims, for mere brute curiosity falsely dubbed "advancement of knowledge," or, what is, if possible, even worse, because this ceaseless mutilation and torture is supposed to promise well-being for the bodies of human beings, and a knowledge whereby they may escape the just fruit of their sins. On the one hand, we have a victim, self-offered, a willing sacrifice. "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to *give his life* a ransom for many." And that blessings to multitudes have flowed from that sacrificial life, not even the coldest rationalist can deny. On the other hand, innumerable unwilling victims, dumb, hopeless, helpless, and, as their torturers believe, destined to no resurrection.

It is suggested that our biologists, followers of the "science of *life*," but in reality practitioners of manifold death, will indeed probe to the secret of things, and cut out the heart of the world-old mystery. But the very progress of science shows that this is almost certainly a delusion. Really great men of science, devotees of those sciences which have no torture-chamber, are beginning to see that Life is not to be sought in the interstices of veins and nerves, or the cellular tissue of the brain. That Life, like Matter or Force, is a great unity, manifesting through these, but in no sense generated by them. That Life is a mystery indeed, but a divine mystery, only to be penetrated by reverence, purity, obedience. It is certain that every year which passes will mark an advance in this true theory of Being, that every year it will be more manifest that the countless victims of "scientific curiosity" perished in the torture-chambers in vain.

But it is said that this ceaseless mutilation, this infecting of helpless animals with foul diseases, is "for the good of mankind." If it be so, then no baser charge has ever been brought against humanity than this, that we, the beings of heart and mind and soul are willing to accept any benefit at such a price. The innocent for the guilty. The helpless as a ceaseless holocaust for the wiser, stronger, more gifted beings. If we could believe that mankind, as a whole, would willingly and knowingly accept bodily well-being and immunity, at the cost of incessant torture and mutilation inflicted

on helpless, voiceless brutes, then we should be inclined to abjure our humanity.

But we are inclined to hold two beliefs. The first is, that this plea of "the good of humanity" is very often used in bad faith, as a cloak for "the advancement of science," that is, brute curiosity, and as a sop to a public opinion, which would otherwise make this iniquity impossible, as it has made slavery impossible. The second belief is, that where this plea of "the good of humanity" is put forward in good faith, it is a complete delusion. In the first place, we are convinced that experiments on animals, even were they otherwise justifiable, must of necessity be quite inconclusive for human beings. The differences are too great and fundamental. In the second place, we are convinced that by far the greater part of human maladies have their origin in conditions that are not present in normal animal life at all, or are present only through infection from man.

Here are some weighty comments on this specious claim of the benefits which have accrued to mankind from the practice of vivisection: To begin with, we have been told that one of the greatest triumphs of the vivisectors is the anti-toxin treatment of diphtheria. But far from supporting this contention, the returns of the Registrar-General show that the death-rate per million persons during the five years 1901-1905 (the anti-toxin period) was far above that of the pre-anti-toxin period, 1876-1890. Again, in a recent work with the striking title, *Our Meanest Crime*, Dr. J. H. Clarke writes: "So far from vivisection saving human beings from being experimented on, it actually necessitates it." And Dr. J. S. Harndall, Royal Veterinary Surgeon, says: "There is no proof that the millions of animals that have been cruelly tortured and sacrificed to the whims of scientists have produced the slightest benefit to science." A distinguished French physician, Dr. Foveau de Courmelles, adds his testimony: "With the recent discoveries concerning electricity and the X-rays, an entirely new science has been born. To promote knowledge now, it is not necessary to resort to vivisection." Finally, we may add the witness of a most distinguished operator: "As a surgeon I have performed a very large number of operations, but I do not owe a particle of my knowledge and skill to vivisection. I challenge any member of my profession to prove that vivisection has in any way advanced the science of medicine, or tended to improve the treatment of disease." These are the words of the late Dr. C. Clay.

But it has been left to what is called "the new surgery" to add the crowning abomination to this evil development of "science." We

quote the *New York Times*, November 7, 1908: "Some of the wonders of experimental surgery accomplished at the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research in this city were made public yesterday at the opening session in Philadelphia of the American Philosophical Society. Dr. Alexis Carrel described the grafting of one dog's leg on another dog's body. The leg was taken from a dead dog and grafted on a fox-terrier. In three weeks' time the wound healed and the dog was able to use the new leg. He had perfect control of it. Cats' kidneys have been transplanted to other cats, even after the organs have been in cold storage sixty days. Human arteries and jugular veins have been interchanged, and the patients have not been able to tell the difference. It is entirely possible, Dr. Carrel thinks, to apply some of these methods to the relief of suffering humanity. This is the end towards which the Rockefeller Institute is working. The chief difficulty will be to get healthy organs to transplant. It was suggested by Dr. W. W. Keen that when a healthy man dies, his kidneys may be kept in cold storage until it is possible to operate upon someone suffering from an incurable kidney disease. What has been done with the kidneys, Dr. Keen thinks, can also be done with other human organs. Already a knee joint from the leg of a dead man has been used to replace the injured joint in a living person."

We apologise to our readers for inflicting on them this horrible account of a detestable development of "science." The necessity which forces us to transcribe it, and them to read it, is a kind of vicarious atonement, whereby we try to lessen the nation's part in this brand-new sin. Profoundly believing, as we do, that the "sufferings of humanity," of which Dr. Carrel so feelingly speaks, are the exact measure of the sins of humanity, we wholly disbelieve in the possibility of alleviating suffering in any way other than by lessening sin. And we are convinced that nothing worse has been devised, in an age fertile in evil, than this shocking attempt to "alleviate suffering" by the mutilation of the dead.

For even in this "scientific" age, we hold to the belief, old-fashioned perhaps, antiquated perhaps, that the maladies of mankind are the fruit of sin; and of sin in which, for the most part, the normal animals have no part at all. To begin with things entirely obvious, is it not conceded by the best opinion of the best men, that the use of alcohol is a fruitful cause of suffering; not only by the wide demoralisation it spreads among human beings, and especially among the more helpless races, but even more, by its direct lethal effect on the very powers of life, so that, with a

sharp and penetrating truth, "the sins of the fathers are visited on the children." Is it not to the direct action of alcohol on the generative forces that we are to attribute the birth of so many sickly, morbid, incompetent or even imbecile children? The mutilation of animals will not help us here. This is a purely human sin.

Again, is it not certain that not merely disease, but proneness to disease, which characterises "the rotten bodies of our day and generation" is due to our feeding on "carrion," as one of the wise has said? And even more far-reaching, deeper, more demoralising, is our general practice with regard to sex. Why is it, to begin with, that the process of bearing young is, for the animals, and even for the simpler human races, a harmless, painless incident, hardly more disturbing to bodily well-being than the pursuit of food, or sleep; while, for our "civilised" races, the bearing of a child is a sharp peril, bringing the mother close to death's door, and indeed in too many cases even through the door? How many of our most "cultivated," "sensitive" and "advanced" women look forward to the birth of a child with dread and chill apprehension, as being, in fact, a deadly danger? And how many who thus awake in fear in the darkness of the night will face the truth—that this dread evil is the fruit of "countless centuries of abuse" and degradation? Here again the torture of animals will not help us. This is once more a human sin.

What are we to say of the far graver matter, the result of this terror, the deliberate refusal to bear children, while continuing the abuse of the powers of life? How deep this evil may go, how it may sear the inner nature, blunt the spiritual faculties, dull and darken the vision of the inner eyes, only those wise ones know, who watch over mankind, and now, as of old, "give their lives a ransom for many." But, it will be said, men are at fault also. Yes, deeply and most culpably. And not least in this: that these perpetual sins are possible largely through the effort of men, to wit, those very men of science who have so far explored the sources of life, that they have found ways to cheat life itself, and to pervert the very forces of life into sterile sensualism. But this is the sin not of men alone, or of women alone. It is a widespread sin of our humanity, and most of all, of our civilised races. Therefore, in the name of "science" let the animals suffer, who have never sinned, if haply through their tortures we may go on sinning, and yet escape the penalty of our sin. That is what is meant by the pursuit of vivisection "for the good of humanity."

Do we therefore advise the reckless propagation of children, to be born, as our reformers tell us, into homes of poverty and misery? Far from it. What we do advocate is not reckless propagation of children, but chastity. If our population be so great, that there is no room for more, then in heaven's name, let us be clean. Surely that is not impossible. Here, at long last, we may learn from the animals. For it is notorious that, under stress of suffering, or in captivity, many of the nobler animals cease altogether to propagate their race. They do not, as does mankind, seek out subtle ways of corrupting nature. But with tragic simplicity they cease from the continuance of their kind. Here is one lesson our biologists might learn, if they are veritably in search of wisdom.

We have spoken at times, and with clear sincerity, of the abuses of the Roman Church, which bears so heavily on the hearts and minds of so many lovers of truth. But we venture to say that for one thing much will be forgiven, even of the darkness of the Inquisition. And that one thing is the devotion and real purity which the Roman Church has both preached and exemplified for centuries; showing, in its consecrated priests, its nuns and monks, that chastity is possible, even for humanity, as it is possible for "the beasts that perish." One cannot doubt that chastity has been made far more credible, far more easy of realisation for millions, through the example of so many devoted men and women, who have offered not merely a part, but all of their life-force, to the service of spiritual life. And from that example, real chastity in marriage has been made more possible: the clean and normal birth of healthy children. The attitude of the Roman Church toward the sins we have spoken of will assuredly cover a multitude of sins.

How long will that sanative influence prevail against our "age of science"? Surely the very question suggests the obvious truth, that in too many ways, the pursuit of science is not diminishing the sin, and therefore the suffering of humanity, but is rather adding to both. Is it not through the very "progress of science" that these outrages on the powers of nature become possible? Or do our men of science really believe that, through the expedients of their surgery and their therapeutics, they can defy the law, and cheat both nature and nature's Nemesis? It cannot be doubted that they do. And here we have the evidence of a far deeper and more penetrating evil, one more significant and far-reaching than any single sin.

This far-reaching evil is the gradual atrophy of the inner powers, as a consequence of a low and material standard of life, not merely of practice, but also of belief. Especially is this true in America,

where there are no standards handed down from a better age, no traditions of nobler living, to check mere secularism and sensation-mongering. For what is so much of the struggle for wealth, of which we hear so much in the platform of all parties, the periodicals of all sects and sections, but a low and vulgar worship of sensationalism, the evidence of natures so coarse and rudimentary, that they can only get the sense of living, through a ceaseless stream of sharp sensations and personal triumphs, which keep the alert vanity perpetually stimulated? These perpetual stimulants to the lower personal nature slowly but surely deaden the higher and genuinely human nature, and make it more and more difficult for the voice of the soul to make itself heard. How can the still, small voice become audible, in the midst of the roar of sensationalism, the din of personal strifes, and surface vanities? Nor is it to our credit as a nation, that, where a widespread protest has been made against the rush for wealth, it has too often been made on the plea that more should be admitted to the struggle, and not on any principle of greater nobleness.

The same coarseness, the same vulgar sensation-hunting is rapidly and thoroughly corrupting our literature. There was a time when it seemed that America would give birth to a new literature of idealism, would catch and echo the large utterance of the early gods, in a movement full of promise for all humanity. Hopeful though we may be, optimist though we may wish to be, yet it is becoming painfully evident that that happy prospect seems more and more remote. It is not merely that we have crude and coarse sensationalism in our cheaper and more mercenary daily papers. After all, they are written to supply a crude and coarse taste, to stir nerves already jaded by the strife and struggle for wealth. The real evil, the deep-seated harm is elsewhere. Take up any of those popular magazines which, with their harshly-colored covers, adorn our book-stalls, and which, selling by the hundred thousand, are becoming almost the only literature of millions of American homes. They are almost wholly filled with stories, well-written in a certain sense, vivacious, smart, direct. But look a little deeper. Are they not, in almost every case, stories of "success," that cheap and surface success so dear to the American heart, where the hero gains "wealth and position," and worships the heroine, not for any finer qualities of heart or sacrifice, but simply for bodily attractiveness and animal spirits. Looked at closely, the vast mass of these stories silently preach a low and selfish ideal of life; a life of surfaces, a life of sensationalism, a cheap indulgence of egotism, whether amatory or political or financial.

Our protest against this immeasurably vulgar literature does not spring from super-sensitive nerves or a longing to see the craze of æstheticism, or the psychic vagaries of the decadents repeated in America. It springs from a deeper source: from the conviction, namely, that the low and coarse view of life inculcated by our "popular" magazines cuts us off, not merely from good literature, which is much, but from right life itself, which is infinitely more. This ceaseless strumming on the lower chords of our natures, this endless searching after the sensational, as the motive for literature, strengthens and hardens the minds and egotisms that feed on it, and at the same time slowly atrophies the higher powers, which make not only for good literature, but for real life. For the plain truth is, that this whole life of sensationalism is a cheap and coarse illusion, and not life at all.

Life is holier, deeper, sterner than our "successful" novelists would have us believe. Life holds higher prizes than such "success" as they conceive. It also holds graver penalties than they dare to contemplate. They shudder at "poverty" as the great failure, and, if the story is to sell, their heroes must gain wealth and welfare. But there is a far worse poverty, a deeper failure, to wit, the failure of a nation, the poverty of heart and soul of the men and women who compose it; and this is met by a far graver penalty. The failure to penetrate below the jarring and jangling currents of surface life means something more than the failure to attain to saintly quietism, though that is much. It means the failure to reach, to enter, to become one with, the great permanent currents of Life itself. And he who will not enter the flame shall perish with the smoke.

The life of men and nations is as the life of a tree, to wit, the primal tree of Humanity. A nation or a man may elect to play one of two parts: either to enter deeper into the life of the tree of humanity, to be sap of its sap, to become one with branch and stem; or, to live as a leaf, to perish as a leaf, scattered before the cold winds of Time's inevitable winter. If we seek and find the deeper currents of life, humbly obey the profounder laws, subjecting ourselves to them in sacrifice and self-effacement, then may we indeed become one with the deeper life, the life which is everlasting. But if, through the desire of sensation, through the vulgar lust of a cheap and sensual success, we elect to live in the strident life of the surface, then our fate is the fate of the scum and surface froth; destined to perish without trace, without regret.

Let the most charitable, the most optimistic among us say what signs there are in our American life, that there is any appre-

ciation of this deep and fundamental truth; what warranty there is for believing that either our literature or our practice is based on any higher aspiration than the desire for cheap personal prominence and achievement. And cannot the dullest among us see that this base view of life is already bringing its Nemesis, in the deliberate choice of sterility which has already been spoken of? But there is a worse sterility than the failure to bear children. There is the sterility of the soul, of spiritual life, which means the withering of the roots of life itself; the drying up and rotting away of those powers which, where soul-life is ardently sought and its laws obeyed, do indeed draw into the soul the power and blessing of the deep well-springs, circulating through the veins of the soul the water of immortality. Beneath the outer sterility which cuts off the life of the race, is the inner sterility which cuts at the root of spiritual life itself. Of both, the cause is the same: the worship of cheap and sensual aims, which debase the life-forces and embody them in forms that must perish like autumn leaves.

Let us, in conclusion, suppose that, in the purposes of the gods, a race had been destined to high and noble ends; to become, indeed, the seed and promise of a more blest, more spiritual humanity. And let us suppose, further, that such a race had for a time walked worthily of its high calling, and then, through too much "success," too much cheap "prosperity," had begun to fall away; to choose the lower rather than the higher, the baser instead of the nobler; the path of sensual indulgence, not the way of sacrifice: following, in fact, the course which the people of this country are notoriously following. Then, we may believe, two possibilities might lie in the hand of high Providence. Either it might be decreed that such a race should be suddenly swept away, with the stern sentence: "Cut it away. Why cumbereth it the ground?" Or, if the process of degeneration had not gone too far, and there was still life in the roots, then Providence, in stern mercy, might decree for that people a drastic purification, to wit, the terrible purification of long suffering and sorrow, whether through war or pestilence; until pain and misery and failure had undone the evil that too much "prosperity" and the cheap worship of it had wrought; and at least a remnant of the nation, tried as by fire, might come back to the deep realities of life, to purity, to sacrifice, to holiness. In this harsh and terrible way might the purposes of Providence be attained, and the nation, destined for high things, but perversely seeking low things, might be brought back to the path of life, and become at last a truly spiritual power, uplifting all humanity.

FRAGMENTS.

I.

I HAVE never been able to think highly of a religion that was not attractive. Beauty and holiness must be linked together. Religion should make a man cheerful; it should make him uncomplaining; and it must make him personally more winning, more attractive, or else there is something wrong with his religion.

The minor virtues are not to be despised, and many who now neglect them would be astonished to discover how materially their cultivation assists in the growth of the greater virtues. Life is made up of little things, and we need for ourselves and for others, the little virtues with which to meet them. I have often known a poor soul to go discouraged and hungry for lack of a cheerful word or a winning smile. Perhaps those who, unthinking, denied them, were possessed of many fine qualities of mind and heart. Nevertheless, the opportunity came to them and they passed it by; an alms was prayed for and they took no heed.

There are alms of the soul as well as those of the body, and they are far more important and far more precious. Where one man starves for bread there are an hundred starving for spiritual charity.

We cannot afford to live so much on the surface of things; life itself calls us deeper; for life is the greatest of the fine arts, the most tremendous of conflicts, the most splendid of adventures. We shall not make it tawdry, therefore, in artificial trappings, nor inconsequent in idle inconsecutiveness, nor futile from passivity and neglect.

Unfailing sweetness, patience and good humour, careful attention to the comforts and pleasures of others, a ready assistance, a smiling compliance,—these are little things, but, believe me, adepts have developed from just such trifles where the heart of true devotion prompted.

By applying Emerson's test, and in this light appearing before the bar of your own conscience daily, you may be amazed to find what progress you will make, what constant sacrifice and self-control will be necessary, and how much nearer and clearer will become those mountain peaks of attainment which formerly seemed so far away, but which "the day of small things" has made possible to us.

II.

Does not the great fact of Death standing ever in the midst of Life enable us to comprehend that material existence is *not* the Reality;

but that Reality lies back and within these things of sense and time; in that unseen world whose denizens have in all conditions unbroken continuity of consciousness, unfading perception, unclouded realization?

I say then that Death is a great torch which Divine Providence has placed in this darkened world, to light the way; it is the light-house of the ocean of Avidya.

III.

Remember that we invite what we fear, that the constrictive power of anxiety keeps from us the good which rightfully is ours, and which would come to us did we permit it. Success is for the man who is sure of success, not for him who merely longs, doubting at heart. One must *know* one will win, then victory is certain; the powers of earth bow before their conqueror. This knowledge must spring from calm, interior conviction, the conviction of him who has placed himself on the divine side of nature, who has claimed his inherent birthright of God-hood, whose faith cannot be shaken, since it is founded upon those things which, invisible to the eyes of sense, are yet most vitally real and true; who commands and must be obeyed. Dominions, principalities and powers are all under the feet of such a man, he guides and controls them, bending them to his will. He must be absolutely sure of himself, then he cannot fail. Whatever the conflict may be, undertaken in this spirit, success is certain.

Whether success lead him to the right or the left-hand path is then for him to determine. For of all trials success is the greatest; it is the trial of the gods.

He who can remain equal minded in the flush of victory; who can maintain the simple, childlike spirit in the midst of luxury; can remain detached in heart from powers and possessions; continue the god, never stooping to be the slave,—such an one has gone far upon the path of life and immortality.

Make your success then, but make yourself a greater man that you have succeeded. Make the world a better world for it, until the farthest star may rejoice in its course that there is such a king among men.

IV.

I see one most blessed explanation of all our pain and suffering, of whatsoever kind,—that the Master loves us enough to be willing to take this trouble to train us. And what an immensity of love that represents! He must also find something in us worth the expenditure of the effort, else his great wisdom would forbid the

extravagance. In the first thought lie peace and comfort, the peace of the child on its mother's breast; in the second, a grand incentive, a spur to courage and perseverance, and vistas of illimitable hope. So long as he is not discouraged with us, we dare not become discouraged with ourselves; so long as his compassion sees the need of further discipline, we can but accept it gratefully. The wonder is, not that we have so much to bear, but that, considering our endless failings, vices, and sins, we have so little. It shows great regard for our weakness that we are led along so gently; not hurried up the rugged path most of the Masters travelled.

Dear Lord, since I am so unworthy of your compassion, make me at least to *feel* it. Since I am weak and prone to despondency, give me the strength to justify your faith.

CAVÉ.

"Thou hast but one thing of thine own, from which no power of all the worlds can rend thee. That is—thy Will.

"Thou canst make it Will of the underworld (bitter and dark), or Will of the over-spaces; ally it to Anarchy or Law. The choice is thine; thy Will it is, inhering in no other. A free Will, freely given thee; a heaven-born thing—thine own.

"Though thou canst transmute this Will unto base uses, forcing it to dwell and work among the beasts, thou canst not forever chain it there. Heaven-born, it seeks reunion with the Will of the Father, that Source Divine from which it sprang at the creative Voice, to which—when the cycle of Manifestation ends and that Voice falls silent—it must return. Shall it return naked as it set forth? Or—bearing thee with it?

"Behold thy scintilla. It seeks the Flame. Thou canst detain; it is thine own while thou hast being. But—choose the underworlds, and like them thou must die, thy Will, a shooting star, returning to the Day-Spring of its birth. Art thou for union, or for separation? Choose. Choose NOW."

BOOK OF ITEMS.

NATURAL PSYCHICAL AND SPIRITUAL BODIES.

PART II.

THE part of Gaudapada's poem translated in the present number is so lucid, so simple, so convincing, that any comment on it seems superfluous. Nevertheless, great men have commented on it, and among them even the great Shankara. Therefore we cannot refuse humbly to follow in the great Shankara's footsteps.

Let us begin by reminding our readers of the position of Gaudapada's poem, both chronological and logical. First, as to the personality of Gaudapada. He was, the tradition of Southern India tells us, no other than the sage whom we know as Patanjali, author of the famed Yoga Sutras. And this work, as we understand it, was intended to bridge, and does in fact bridge, the chasm between such splendid works of the prime, as the Mandukya Upanishad, and the closely technical system of the Yoga School, with its precise, practical instructions for duly qualified students. Students who are to approach the Yoga Sutras with some hope of mastering them, need, as we have already seen, two kinds of powers or qualifications. First, the moral powers, the quiet heart, the well-ruled nature, the awakened will, which does all things as to the Master, and the ardent flame of aspiration. Hardly less needful is the clear intellect, the lucid insight, well-poised, swift, luminous. And it is, if we rightly understand the question, chiefly to the end of training the intellect, and endowing it with just such powers, that Gaudapada wrote his famous poem; and that the great Shankara enriched it with the treasures of his peerless, matchless lucidity. No spirit more transparent ever gave forth the Indian Wisdom; and with his clear and critical genius, Shankara is ever the poet, the worshipper.

The present chapter of the poem, the third, seeks to awaken and to strengthen in the understanding a deep realization of the oneness of the individual soul with the universal Soul. And once that realization is reached, the intellect has laid the foundations of lasting sanity. It is of interest to every student of comparative religion and philosophy to find that, just about the time when Gaudapada's poem was written in distant India, Empedocles was thinking his way to like conclusions in the bright land of Hellas, or at least within the realm illumined by Grecian light. Take, for instance, the twentieth and following verses of Gaudapada's poem: "Some would have it that the unborn, everlasting Being comes to birth. But how could

the unborn, the immortal, come to mortality? The immortal becomes not mortal, nor does mortal become immortal;" and compare them with the verses of Empedocles:

More will I tell thee too: there is no birth
 Of all things mortal, nor end in ruinous death;
 But mingling only and interchange of mixed
 There is, and birth is but its name with men....
 But when in man, wild beast, or bird, or bush,
 These elements commingle and arrive
 The realms of light, the thoughtless deem it "birth";
 When they dispart, 'tis "doom of death"; and though
 Not this the Law, I too assent to use....
 Fools! for their thoughts are briefly brooded o'er.
 Who trust that what is not can e'er become,
 Or aught that is can wholly die away.
 From what-is-not what-is can ne'er become;
 So that what-is should e'er be all destroyed,
 No force could compass and no ear hath heard—
 For there 'twill be forever where 'tis set....
 The All hath neither Void nor overflow....
 But with the All there is no Void, so whence
 Could aught of more come nigh?....
 No wise man dreamed such folly in his heart,
 That only whilst we live what men call life
 We have our being and take our good and ill,
 And ere as mortals we compacted be,
 And when as mortals we be loosed apart,
 We are as nothing....
 Behold those elements own equal strength
 And equal origin; each rules its task;
 And unto each its primal mode; and each
 Prevailing conquers with revolving time.
 And more than these there is no birth nor end;
 For were they wasted ever and evermore,
 They were no longer, and the great All were then
 How to be plenished, and from what far coast?
 And how, besides, might they to ruin come,
 Since nothing lives that empty is of them?
 No, these are all, and, as they course along
 Through one another, now this, now that is born—
 And so forever down Eternity....

So far Empedocles. We need not point out that his conception is more objective, that of Gaudapada more interior and mystical.

Yet Empedocles also rises to heights of mysticism, as when he hymns the One in words truly Indian in spirit, though Greek in form:

We may not bring It near us with our eyes,
 We may not grasp It with our human hands....
 For 'tis adorned with never a manlike head,
 For from Its back there swing no branching arms,
 It hath no feet nor knees alert; It lives
 One holy Mind, ineffable, alone,
 And with swift thoughts darts through the universe....

And even more genuinely Indian in both thought and word is his final vision of things to come, when Patience' perfect work shall have been accomplished, and mankind shall be regenerate:

And seers at last, and judges of high hymns,
 Physicians sage, and chiefs o'er earth-born men
 Shall they become, whence germinate the gods,
 The excellent in honors.

And we shall have once more a divine humanity, which shall abide
 At hearth and feast companioned with the immortals,
 From human pains and wasting eld immune.

Such an identity of thought and expression leads us to give greater credence to the old tradition that from India as well as from Egypt the mysteries came to Hellas; and that the Greek sages, when they put forth what our scholars term speculative philosophies, are in reality giving forth, in guarded terms, in symbol and metaphor, the pristine teachings of the Mysteries. With this preface, we take up again the translation of Gaudapada's poem.

GAUDAPADA'S POEM ON THE MANDUKYA UPANISHAD.

III.

One takes refuge in devotion, thinking that he has been evolved by the Creator, and that before this evolution nothing was; such a one is deemed of mean understanding.

Therefore I shall tell of that which is beyond mean understanding, which enters not into birth, which is forever equal; since, though seeming to enter into birth, this is not born at all.

The Supreme Self is likened to space, which is made up of the sum of spaces enclosed in jars, and includes the jars also. This is the best simile for evolution.

When the jars and other containing vessels are destroyed, the spaces that were contained in the jars and the like melt into universal Space. So individual selves melt into the infinite Self.

Just as, when the space contained in any jar is soiled by dust and smoke, the space contained in other jars is not soiled, So all individual selves are not affected by the happiness or sorrow of one individual self.

Everywhere there is difference of form and nature and name. But there is not therefore any difference in Space. This again is a simile of the Universal Self.

Just as the space contained in a jar is neither a separated part nor an evolved effect, of Space, so likewise the individual self is neither a separated part or an evolved effect of the Self.

As space, in the thought of the inexperienced child, seems stained, so does the Self seem to be stained, to those who are unawakened.

As far as dying, being born, going and coming are concerned, in the case of all beings it is just as in the case of Space.

All separate beings are like the creatures of a dream, sent forth by the glamor-power of the Supreme Self. Their relations, of greater and less, or of equals, are no proof that they are real. (10)

For the substance of the Five Veils of the Self, enumerated in the Taittiriya Upanishad, is of the Highest Being, as in the illustration of the portions of space, and Space.

In the contrasted terms of the Teaching of Nectar, the oneness of the Supreme Eternal is taught; just as Space is one, whether it be the space contained in the earth, or in the body of man.

The unity of the undividual soul and the universal Soul is proclaimed. The thought of diversity between them is reproved. Therefore their oneness is the truth.

The description of the individual soul and the universal Soul as separate before the growth of the soul is attained, is only to make intelligible the growth of the soul. It does not represent a reality.

Similes for the Soul, taken from clay that can be moulded, from iron that can be welded, from sparks that come forth from the flame, are different in character. They are but means for the understanding to pass over. There is no real division at all. (15)

As there are three stages of life, the lower, the middle and the higher, so there are three stages of vision. This way of devotion is taught for the sake of attaining these.

Those who believe the individual soul is separate from the universal Soul, each set firm in his own opinion, are in conflict with each other. But this teaching of Oneness is in conflict with none.

For the teaching of Oneness is the transcendental Truth, and duality is a part of it. As they also teach duality, this Truth does not conflict with them.

The Eternal, ever unborn, appears to be divided through Glamor only, for, were the division real, the immortal would take on mortality.

Some would have it that the unborn, everlasting Being comes to Birth. But how could the unborn, the immortal, come to mortality? (20)

The immortal becomes not mortal, nor does the mortal become immortal. For nothing can become the contrary of its own nature.

If any think that what of its own nature is immortal can come to mortality, how can he hold that it stands immortal and changeless?

The Scripture holds the same teaching regarding birth, whether that birth be real or unreal; that alone is certain which is taught by Scripture and affirmed by reason.

Such sentences of Scripture as that which declares "There is no separateness," and "Indra, through glamor, appeared as manifold," prove that He, the ever unborn, appears to be born through Glamor alone.

The sentence of Scripture, which forbids worship of the Formative Power, proves that the Formative Power is not final Reality. And the sentence, "Who can bring Him into birth?" proves that causation is not final Reality. (25)

"It is not that, not that!" This sentence denies all properties in the Self. The Real is sought to be indicated by sheer incomprehensibility.

The birth of the Real is perceived only through Glamor; it is not a reality. He for whom the Real is really born, must think of it as perpetually reborn.

The Unreal never enters birth, whether in reality or through Glamor; just as the son of the barren woman is never born, whether really or in seeming.

As in dream the mind divides itself into the seer and the thing seen through the power of Glamor, in just the same way the mind, in waking, divides itself into the seer and the things seen, through the power of Glamor.

As the mind, which is really not divided, appears as divided in dream; in just the same way the Mind, really not divided, appears as divided in waking. (30)

Whatever division there is, among things animate or inanimate, is an appearance of the Mind's making. When Mind transcends mind, no division any longer exists.

When by awakening to the reality of the Self, the mind's imaginings are brought to rest, then does Mind transcend mind, ceasing to grasp after externals, since naught is left, other than Self, for it to grasp.

The true knowing is declared to be free from imaginings, and not separate from what is known; the Eternal, unborn, everlasting, is what is known; by the unborn the unborn is comprehended.

The condition of the mind which has transcended itself, which is free from imaginings and has reached wisdom, is beyond the condition of dreamless sleep, and different from it.

For in dreamless sleep the mind has simply sunk into quiescence; but when Mind transcends mind it has not simply sunk into quiescence, but has entered completely into the realm of wisdom, the fearless Eternal. (35)

Unborn, beyond drowsiness, beyond dream, beyond both name and form, shining out all at once, all knowledge, beyond the need of specific forms of service.

It has passed beyond all descriptive speech, it has risen above all forms of imagination; it has entered into peace, it is all at once full of light, it is pure vision, unmoved and fearless.

Where no form is perceived by the thought, there is naught to grasp nor to surrender; then the power of knowing has come to rest in the Self. Reaching perfect being, it knows no further birth.

The union with the intangible is hard to perceive for the seekers of union; the seekers of union draw back in fear from That, seeing fear where there is no fear.

The seekers of union think that on perfect control of the mind depend freedom from fear, the conquest of pain, awakening to the light, and everlasting peace. (40)

Just as it is possible to empty the ocean, by picking it up drop by drop on the tip of a blade of kusha grass, so it is possible completely to control the mind by infinite perseverance.

By the right means one should gain control over the mind, whether it be scattered abroad after the feasts of desire, or sunk down in sluggish sloth; for lust and sloth are equal dangers.

Let him turn the mind back from lust by holding in memory the pain of all perishing things; for remembering that all is unborn, he ceases to perceive what is manifest through birth.

Let the mind that is sunk in sloth be awakened; let the mind that is scattered be brought back to peace. Let him know that the mind is prone to unrest and lust; therefore, when it has gained peace, let him keep it in peace.

Let him not allow it to hold with relish to the happiness of this peace, but let him through spiritual vision break free from all attachment. Let him by effort of will bring the mind to oneness with the Self, keeping it poised, in perfect stillness. (45)

When the mind sinks not back in sloth, and scatters itself no more abroad, no longer like a flickering flame, no longer catching false reflections, then it is one with the Eternal, in perfect stillness.

Self-sustained, full of peace, entered into Nirvana, ineffable, is that most excellent joy; it is declared to be the all-knowing unborn, at one with the unborn goal of all knowing.

The individual soul is not really born; it has no real separate being; that is the highest truth, which perceives that naught is really born.

CHARLES JOHNSTON.

WHY I JOINED THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

IN looking backward over the winding road I have travelled toward my present position as a labelled theosophist, it is amusing to note my original standpoint. The Society then existed on the dim horizon of my thoughts as a body of fanatics, charlatans and dupes, engaged in a profitless and foolish enterprise. Far from meaning Divine Wisdom, the word theosophy was vaguely indicative of clairvoyance, spiritualism and legerdemain, with much uproar over misplaced tea-cups and fugitive cigarette-papers.

For which misconception I can now only beg the Society's pardon.

From time to time my eye was caught by items in the newspapers heralding the exposure of theosophic frauds and unmasked Mahatmas. Never can I recollect reading a defence; either the accused were dumb before the shearers, or as is its wont, the free press refused to spoil a good story by a tame explanation. The silence was quite as effective as any explanation could have been: on the face of it there were somewhere defenders or there would not be accusations, but I should not have busied myself weighing evidence for and against them, since there was for me no live issue involved. The question might safely be left to the mills of the gods and to the more hasty Society for Psychical Research.

The attitude of my most clear-thinking friends was either that of scientific materialism or of agnosticism, and I looked upon myself as a weak and mild specimen of the latter class. It was past the time when that great wave of enthusiasm for the new-shorn and naked truth could have swept me quite off my feet; the active fighting days were over; to proclaim oneself an evolutionist and a religious doubter was but following the line of least resistance, instead of calling for the courage and independence it once had demanded. Darwin and Huxley were too victorious to need recruits; the advance guard of the church was already in treaty.

My agnostic ardor was further sapped by the suspicion that religionists had really a stiffer spring-board from which to leap into unselfish action, as well as a more assured resting-place. I loved, too, the concrete body of worship and adoration which I had occasionally sensed. On the other hand, though knowing the Church a great power, its viewpoint as presented to me seemed wofully lacking in reason. "Not for all his faith could see" would I have been of it, though in large measure for it.

For my near-sightedness I here tender another apology.

In the course of time I actually, in person, made the acquaintance of a woman whom I discovered was a Theosophist. I found her a very real person, intensely alive to the finer aspects of life, an awakening and stimulating friend. I never talked Theosophy with her for the same reason that I never talked Catholicism with my Romanist friends, or Christian Science with those of that ilk. Since to them these subjects were evidently vital, it would have been discourteous to exhibit my apathy and distrust. Yet without discussion I distinctly felt her belief and her attitude of aspiration, and I inevitably veered about several points. Theosophy had become something believable by high-minded and intelligent people; a phase of thought worthy of serious approach.

Before long I was presented with a copy of the *Bhagavad Gita*, and I was glad to be able to say how much I honestly liked it; how beautiful I found it; whereupon *The Voice of the Silence* promptly arrived, over which I could only shake a puzzled head. Nevertheless the next Christmas it was pleasant to recognize some quotations in a calendar as from this source, and to find them full of meat when read slowly and separately.

At about this stage in my journey I think I delayed a very long time. The habit, however, of defending theosophy in the abstract from my own abstract doubt grew upon me, also that of saying to scoffers, "But I really don't believe that is their standpoint," giving such reasons as I could, though always adding, "Of course I'm not speaking from the inside——"

Some real and central beauty was dawning on me, but it seemed almost obscured by a murky cloud, which I thought of as occultism and mysticism.

For which confusion of thought I should like to beg the pardon of true occultists and mystics.

My wall of prejudice was being surely and steadily undermined, although I had no foreshadowing that I should desert the agnostic party. I was not in search of a faith. I felt that there were enough things to be accomplished in the active world to fill life twice full, and if one lived conscientiously and industriously one need not trouble about the ultimate end. If there were a divine intelligence, credit would be given to honesty and energy; if not, it was still quite simply the wisest course. As to the burning questions of inequality and injustice, they were apparently inexplicable, and since they were beyond one's power to alter, one would better not dwell on them over much; better just be as decent as possible in one's own small circle, widening it as fast as one could. Yet, since I seemed booked for a semi-defense of something I neither understood

nor fully believed, I chose to be better informed, to get more refuting facts at my disposal. I began borrowing the *QUARTERLY* and discussing the contents with my theosophical friends who had by this time doubled in numbers. I had an amusingly lively time, for I held myself continually in the opposition. Seizing strong points to present to the enemy, weak ones with which to discomfit my friends, both the strong and the weak for my own independent judgment. I also frequented the theosophical meetings, where I had the grace to keep quiet. The membership was small, but the evenings were very beautiful, very simple, marked by a spirit of restraint and tolerance; the devotional atmosphere distinctly to be felt. Only once before had I been aware of this atmosphere in so marked a degree, and then it had had every outer aid to heighten and abet it; a great cathedral, a concourse of devout peasant worshippers and the wonderful voices of the Greek Catholic priests. An outsider could scarcely determine whether the impression had been emotional, æsthetic or religious, or merely human sympathy with the earnest and devout. Here was the same quality, though scarcely a dozen were gathered together, and there was no church, no ritual. I considered this quite beside the question under argument, something one should simply respond to as best one could—being an agnostic.

In all the presented subject-matter there was much that I recognized as old thought-friends, much that appealed to my ordinary understanding, but there were also many things absolutely baffling in their newness and incomprehensibility. There were expressions and similes and symbols which I would certainly have pronounced nonsense, had it not been for my personal respect for those who took them so seriously. Plainly, I might not jeer. The other alternative was to understand, confessing that I had met something beyond my mental depth, something my superficial smattering did not permit me to grasp, which insistently demanded comprehension.

It was alluring and I splashed and plunged in waters too deep for me, occasionally bringing up a pebble or a pearl, but chiefly discovering new depths, new mysteries.

I still intended not to agree when I did understand, but I meant to disagree intelligently, if possible.

Then came a flank movement. In a second-hand book store I found some pamphlets and publications of the Vedanta Society, which I read with avidity. Here was the same philosophy, the same faith and many of the same queer expressions; the same inability, too, to express certain things in good, plain, English words, which had all along been one of my special minor grievances. Doubtful points and dubious statements were here confirmed, and

to my feminine mind carried extra weight from the respect accorded them by various groups of scholars. I thought of the late turmoil over the effort to reconcile scientific discoveries with "revealed religion," and then wondered at the easy welcome this old, old revelation could have accorded them.

I returned to my theosophical discussions practically a convert to the philosophy, anxious to learn the exact tenets of the Society. These seemed at first hopelessly vague.

Of course it declared for the universal brotherhood of man, but so likewise did socialism, and communism, the churches, the constitution of the United States, and so had the French Revolution, each in its own distinctive tongue. One could not adopt or reject any of them solely on the ground of brotherhood, there were other more determining marks.

Tolerance for other religions and opinions and the widening of our knowledge were worthy objects, but did not greatly help to strengthen the outline for which I was searching. All scholarly, cultured and social people were more or less enlisted under such a banner. It was perplexing, too, the way in which the Society disclaimed all dogmatism, then promptly accepted and appropriated the most intricate and definite of all religious systems. The opening sentences of an article would proclaim the unbiased poise of original research, the following page would take for granted or boldly assert a fact which "all theosophists hold." Even the very explicit teachings concerning reincarnation were treated in this puzzling fashion.

It was long before I came to a firm realization that theosophic doctrines were held tentatively, subject always to proof or to refutation, subject to immediate revision should anything present itself more unifying, more perfectly explanatory of life.

Arrived finally at this conception, I found myself disarmed of all criticism save the old tea-cup and cigarette-paper difficulty. I had never been brought quite face to face with this aspect, but I had all along felt its presence, just out of reach, an intangible, illusive wall of I-didn't-know-what, which might prove utterly repellant on closer investigation. However small its proportion to the whole thought-system, it might be a most disturbing element. The miracles of Christianity were of like relative unimportance, but had been prolific doubt-breeders among the honest and ethically minded.

Clearly I must approach and must examine. The strictly theosophical literature was again discounted, partly because of suspected partisanship, partly because the phenomena seemed trivial, the evidence insufficient; so I made literary excursions in every promising direction.

Various biographies of saints and mystics, with their almost unvarying chronicle, were perhaps the most convincing documents which I found—and first of all I think I should make my reverences to Joan of Arc for her direct, unwavering statements to her persecutors, for the corroboration of her marvellous achievement.

Saint Francis of Assisi was a close second, however, while Paracelsus, Swedenborg and William Blake helped build an evidential mass of some bulk, to which the bits of other-worldliness which I was learning to trace in poets, painters and musicians, added weight. The gulf between a Wordsworth who could commence a verse, "Jones when first together" and the wonder-poet trailing clouds of glory through the immortal ode, calls for supernatural explanation as loudly as Joan herself.

Mr. William James, Sir Oliver Lodge, and the late Mr. Myers helped me with their accounts of logical and painstaking investigation, so that when at length I turned back to the once mistrusted theosophical records, their facts were too easily grouped and classified to provoke challenge: dignity, too, was theirs by virtue of the great stimulating power which had proven inherent in them. Evidently the simple, rather common-place starting-point had been necessary, that a large following might grasp the crude facts.

This, I think, constitutes the whole of my mental priming. I had slowly been led to the full acceptance of a great philosophy, a profound religious concept. The actual impetus which drove me to unite with the Society came in the form of a book from the enemy's camp, called *Isis-Very-Much-Unveiled*. I read it with growing indignation, it was so manifestly unfair, so unscrupulous in its use of flippant humor. At the time of publication it had probably been a formidable weapon, but during the interim freshly-established truths had turned aside too many of its assertions for the irony to be properly biting.

The book served me greatly in being the caustic statement by a keen opponent of the most damaging charges which could be lodged; it cleared away lurking doubts and suspicions as no elaborate arguments of enthusiastic partisans could have done. Moreover, it gave me a reason for actually joining the maligned body.

If one believed in a cause open to such attacks, one should be in a position to defend the faith from within the ranks. So forthwith I made my application for membership and was duly admitted to the Theosophical Society.

A. E.

THEOSOPHY AND SOCIALISM.

[A question and answer about Socialism were published in the April QUARTERLY, as part of the "Notes and Comments." We afterwards received a letter of protest from Mr. William L. Garver, author of a novel entitled *The Brother of the Third Degree*. We print Mr. Garver's letter with the original question and answer and some comment by another writer.—EDITOR.]

QUESTION: I am unable to understand why the THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY takes the attitude it does towards Socialism. I am not a Socialist, though I am acquainted with many who so call themselves; but Socialism is a Brotherhood, and works specifically for the helping and uplifting of Humanity. Why then is not Theosophy, which has the same fundamental objects, in sympathy with it? Surely it cannot be because of different views regarding economic adjustments, as such details would hardly seem to come within the general scope of Theosophic teaching and practice. I would be glad of some definite points.

P. K. S.

ANSWER: The Editor of the QUARTERLY has sent this question to me for reply, knowing that I am in no sense a Socialist, but that I have been for many years a close student of it from various points of view. It is a large and complicated subject—an incoherent subject in its present stage of indefinite ideals and diverse conclusions and opinions—and therefore one hardly to be dealt with in the contracted space of the "Questions and Answers." I should think, furthermore, that so far as essential points are concerned, the querent might have found many of these in the various articles on the subject which have appeared in this journal from time to time, and to which reference is made. I may, however, offer certain suggestions which to my mind are pertinent, and afford no escape from the conclusions that the two viewpoints—Theosophy and Socialism—are, and always must be, diametrically opposed.

First on this matter of Brotherhood. Here Socialism builds a fence and says all who are within it are Brothers; all without, unless or until they can be brought within its limits, are enemies or at least outsiders. (Of course I do not speak of the bitter or aggressive forms of Socialism, as these could hardly enter into our discussion.) This is an immediate recognition of sect or caste or creed; call it as you will, the idea is the same. Theosophy says all men *are* Brothers, regardless of race or sect or creed, or color, or any other distinction; regardless of their goodness or evil; regardless of their recognition of the fact or their opposition to it; regardless of whether they are friends

of society, or enemies of it. For this Brotherhood is not an organization, nor can it consist in organization, no matter how widespread or broad, but is in itself a fundamental fact in Nature, the oneness or identity of all souls with the Oversoul. This oneness of soul may and does co-exist with the utmost divergence of mind and emotion. Therefore Theosophy says that for the realization of this Brotherhood, man must become a more spiritual being, must grow into closer contact with the soul where this condition perpetually obtains, and that all which makes man more spiritual makes of necessity for Brotherhood, and all which tends to make him more material, makes against it. So much for theory—the briefest possible indication, but careful study will demonstrate more and more the fundamental cleavage in the two conceptions. Then as to practice. Theosophy holds that Socialism makes not for but *against* Brotherhood in that it makes for material, not for spiritual aims. Theosophy holds that man makes environment, not environment the man, since the soul under propulsion of wisely directed Divine Law, is pushing forever and ceaselessly upward and outward. Theosophy holds that it is our inestimable privilege to aid this process; first by full recognition of it; second by rigid self-purification (“take first the beam from thine own eye, then shalt thou see clearly to take the mote from thy brother’s eye”), and third by removing as far as possible all which impedes the full action of this Divine Law of Evolution in the Universe. In many a detail it could here join hands with Socialism in special acts of reform, but it sees, and sees clearly, that Socialism’s *material attitude towards reform* is a far greater bar to genuine progress than the matters it seeks to redress, and therefore as turning men’s minds towards the body and away from the soul, Socialism constitutes a barrier *in itself* to advance, as largely representative of the ignorance and blindness of the mind absorbed in matter, to its true and enduring interest.

The ethics of Socialism preclude belief in the immortality of the soul. I know that this has been and will be vehemently denied; nevertheless those to whom the immortality of the Soul is not an accepted theory but a *living fact*, can read my meaning. “According to your faith be it done unto you,” said the Master. We need then above all things to widen and deepen our faith. In these days faith is being wonderfully *broadened*, but with a tendency to become *shallower*; the amount often being no greater, but merely distributed differently. Theosophy rests upon the soul and the soul alone. In its teaching the body is a shadow that comes and goes according as the Light is placed. That which causes the shadow therefore is its concern—the Light, and that which stands before it.

D. R. T.

To the Editor of The Theosophical Quarterly.

Dear Sir: In regard to the article in the April QUARTERLY, upon the subject of Socialism and Theosophy, I cannot agree with D. R. T. that the former is incoherent, in a stage of indefinite ideals and diverse conclusions and opinions. Whatever apparent diversity there may exist among Socialists, does not arise from any disagreement of principles or of ultimate aims, but from policies surrounding the methods to be used to bring or aid in bringing the ultimate desired; in other words, all differences are purely in regard to practical tactics, and throughout the entire civilized world this movement has a never before equaled homogeneity or unity of consciousness and aim.

The writer says Socialists build a fence and say that all who are within it are Brothers; all without it are enemies, or at least outsiders.

Unfortunately for the accuracy of this statement, the Socialists do not build the fence. The recognition of a fact is not an advocacy of the evils arising from that fact. The Socialists, by recognizing the fact that in all civilized societies there are two classes, workers who produce, and exploiters who live off of the products of others, are not by recognition of this fact advocating this division into classes. Far from it, they are profoundly sorry that this division in society exists; they say that such a condition should cease and the causes that lead to antagonistic classes should be removed in order that the entire human family can be united into a harmonious whole where the interests, material as well as spiritual, are all in mutual accord.

Such a condition of mutual identity of all interests the Socialists contend can only be brought about by the abolition of the competitive industrial system which pits man against man in a struggle for a material existence which of necessity engenders hate and selfishness. Therefore they advocate, without exception, the substitution of a mutual co-operative system of industry where all work in harmonious accord, in lieu of the present system of competition. The writer says we recognize sects, castes and creeds. True; but again we repeat, the recognition is not to be confounded with the advocacy of the thing. Does the brother deny that sects, castes and creeds exist?

Again, he says Theosophy says all men *are* Brothers. The Socialist concedes this theoretically, but desires to remind the writer that they do not *ACT* like Brothers. So far from denying the fact that all men are by nature bound together in the universal tie of Brotherhood, the red symbol they everywhere use and the meaning of which has been so grossly perverted, proclaims this fact in no uncertain manner. Take a drop of blood from the arteries of a King, Emperor or President and let them fall upon a sheet of white paper beside drops from the arm of the humblest blacksmith or negro, and no chemist with all the delicate instruments of his laboratory, no biologist with the most powerful microscope, can distinguish any difference between those drops of red. Therefore the Red Flag, in its true meaning, proclaims that all men are possessed of one common attribute or quality and naturally are Brothers, but artificial, man-made conditions have divided them into classes, a fact that every Socialist most sincerely regrets and is trying by every means in his power to remedy.

Again, the writer says that Socialism makes *against* Brotherhood in that it makes for material and not for spiritual aims. In answer to this I wish to call attention to a fact that Socialists themselves often overlook and that is, that while the Socialists say that the great mass of human beings act in conformity with what they believe to be their material interests, the few, in fact every militant Socialist to-day is not working for his material interests. He is sacrificing them, he carries the flag of an unpopular movement, he suffers the scorn, ridicule, contempt and misrepresentations of those around him. He loses his job and spends

his little savings in an unselfish propaganda for future generations. He doubts or realizes that what he labors for will ever be accomplished in his life time. Often, discouraged, he ceases from his arduous labors; but it is only temporarily, for he has become inoculated with a spiritual force, and once his blood is infected with this energy, death alone brings surcease from his labors. In other words, the Socialist workers of to-day are impelled by spiritual aims. Their rewards are not in high salaried positions, political or commercial advancement, but in that exhilaration of soul which comes from working in harmony with the natural forces which are carrying humanity into a higher civilization. Contradictory though it may appear, they are denying themselves, surrendering their material interests in the espousal of an unpopular movement.

And yet, these militant workers in the Socialist movement, those in the vanguard, are not rising above their environment; they are as truly responding to their environment as the mass who consider only their visible material gains. But the environment these few respond to is from the invisible, spiritual side of life. The term environment is not to be limited to the visible material things or conditions without or around us, but also comprehends all the subtle states or conditions within or invisible to us.

With this conception no Theosophist need fear that Socialism will impede his spiritual unfoldment. On the contrary it will give him the opportunity every day to deny himself in order that he may find his own true Inner Self.

How the writer comes to the conclusion that the ethics of Socialism precludes belief in the immortality of the soul is past understanding. The reverse is everywhere apparent. The humblest worker in this great world movement, with no conception of metaphysical subtleties, intuitively feels that he is helping to build a civilization in which he will sometime live. Even aged workers, who have passed the limit of three score years and ten, feel this certitude. What does it mean other than that they shall live again in the social system they have labored for? But what can the drones say, those who drift with the *Laissez faire* and do nothing or only passively to aid in bringing the Kingdom of Heaven on earth?

Most truly do we need a wider and deeper faith, as the writer says, a faith that will impel us to labor unceasingly in the face of contumely, misrepresentation, material losses and many misunderstandings, confident that the conflict develops our character, exalts our soul, and that what we sow we will ultimately reap, even though it be only in lives to come.

WILLIAM L. GARVER.

Mr. William L. Garver is undoubtedly sincere in his defence of Socialism. But in the letter printed above, he seems to modify the expression of his views so as to meet what he would perhaps describe as the prejudices of theosophical students. In a pamphlet entitled *Socialism in Brief*, which he was good enough to send us with his letter, he states his principles with much greater directness and lucidity. He there says: "*Even selfish actions, when truly selfish, tend to bring the ideal toward which all humanity is evolving*" (page 20); and a little further on he adds: "There is no reason in nature, why this planet should not become a paradise, and this *without any moral reformation of man*, but simply by bringing him to a realization of his own interests, and the establishment of conditions where the interest of every one else will be identical with his, which will be the case when every form of exploitation is abolished" (p. 33).

It would be difficult to express more clearly the fundamental difference between Socialism and Theosophy. It should, indeed, be unnecessary to say more on the subject. But, in spite of the fact that Mr. Garver himself insists that all differences between Socialists "are purely in regard to practical tactics," and that their "unity of consciousness and aim" is perfect, our experience leads us to believe that many Socialists, should they chance to learn that one of themselves has so frankly stated their position, would immediately repudiate both him and his avowal. If they were to do so, they would be untrue to the principles and platform of their party. For Mr. Garver is undoubtedly orthodox, socialistically, in his statement. No Socialist can consistently maintain, as Theosophists maintain, that selfish actions must necessarily bring about the very reverse of ideal conditions, and that this planet must remain a hell until the "moral reformation of man," which Mr. Garver insists is unimportant, becomes an accomplished fact. In other words, the theosophical belief that it is motive above all that counts, and that nothing can turn this world into a paradise except the unselfishness of men, is the exact opposite of the doctrine of Socialism.

So, also, in regard to Brotherhood. Mr. Garver, rather rashly as we see it, defends the symbolism of the Red Flag (the history of the Red Flag being by no means attractive), and asks us to believe that if we take a drop of blood from the arteries of a king or emperor, and compare it with drops from the arm of a blacksmith or negro, no chemist, and "no biologist with the most powerful microscope, can distinguish any difference between those drops of red." It is upon this supposed fact that Mr. Garver bases his belief that brotherhood is a fact in nature. Unfortunately, Mr. Garver's statement happens to be incorrect. The truth is that the blood of no two men is alike, and that, with a very ordinary microscope, the difference can be distinguished. Chemically also there is as much difference between the blood of any two men as there is difference in their outer appearance. Any attempt to base a belief in brotherhood upon physical identity will result in a desire for physical promiscuity. We base our belief in brotherhood upon spiritual unity, in "the oneness or identity of all souls with the Oversoul." And we insist that instead of "bringing the Kingdom of Heaven on earth," as Mr. Garver proposes to do, we must raise earth to the Kingdom of Heaven—a diametrically contrary proceeding.

Mr. Garver, in reply to the statement by D. R. T., that "all men *are* brothers, regardless of race or sect or creed or color or any other distinction," retorts that while this is true theoretically, the fact is that "in all civilized societies there are two classes, workers who produce, and exploiters, who live off of the products of others," and

that a true brotherhood can only be brought about "by the abolition of the competitive industrial system which pits man against man in a struggle for a material existence."

Here at once we discover the result of false premises. Unbrotherly acts are attributed by Socialists to an inconvenient or faulty environment. Theosophy, as the present writer understands it, insists that unbrotherly acts are due primarily to unbrotherly hearts, or to the selfishness of men. It denies absolutely that any sort of environment can make the conquest of self impossible, or that any outer reorganization of society will make unselfishness easier. Practically, in departments of work which have the least possible connection with our industrial system, such as work done voluntarily for a church or fraternal organization, one meets with quite as much rivalry, backbiting and jealousy as in business or in politics. This cannot be due to economic competition, but simply to lack of understanding of that spiritual unity which it is the destiny of man to realize, but in which, as yet, he does not even believe.

We do not wish to discuss the matter, in these pages, as a question of political economy; but it may not be out of place to consider briefly Mr. Garver's statement that society is divided into two classes, the "workers who produce, and exploiters who live off the products of others." This is one of the principal tenets of Socialism. What are the facts? At no period in the history of the world have "the workers," so-called, produced anything except under the management of the few, who are described as "exploiters" merely because they work with their brains instead of with their hands. To organize labor is just as necessary as to perform it. Not only is that true, but organizing ability and creative enterprise is work of a higher order than mere physical exertion, and is entitled to a very much larger recompense.

Suppose that two men set to work to dig two cellars, each one for himself. When these cellars have been dug to a certain depth, one man pauses to construct a wheelbarrow or hoist by means of which he will be able more readily to remove the dirt. The other man continues to throw the dirt out with his spade, and thus expends a greater quantity of energy, and proceeds more slowly than the other. When this slower and less intelligent workman finds that the other man has finished his job, he has just enough sense to wish to borrow the wheelbarrow or hoist, so as to expedite his own labor. But the man who has made the wheelbarrow or hoist has a wife and family to support, and wants to use his device elsewhere. So he replies that he can lend his capital (for the wheelbarrow or hoist of his own making has now become his capital) only for a certain price; and this price may be paid in the labor of the other workman or in some other vehicle of exchange, representing value. Ac-

according to Socialism, the workman with the brains is "exploiting" the worker without the brains. We can admit nothing of the sort.

Again, Mr. Garver says that the recognition of sects, castes, and creeds should not be confounded with their advocacy; and he asks, "Does the brother deny that sects, castes, and creeds exist?" He does not seem to have quite understood what "the brother" meant. Theosophists do not shut their eyes to facts. We also recognize the existence of sects and castes and creeds; but, unlike Socialists, we do not as a rule advocate an attempt to legislate these out of existence. We would not force all men to worship in one church and to eat at one table. Socialists would. We believe (speaking merely for those who accept the esoteric philosophy) in "removing as far as possible all which impedes the full action" of the Divine Law of Evolution in the Universe; we believe that the widest freedom should be allowed to different sects, and that to legislate against caste distinctions is useless and worse than useless. There is nothing inherently evil in such differences. Men are not made in one mould, and the expression of differences is better than their artificial suppression, until such differences cease to exist in fact. We must broaden men's minds and enlarge their sympathies, before we can bring about any real or lasting reform in outer conditions.

In India, for instance, to attempt legislation against the caste system would involve a bloody revolution and would end in failure. The people themselves would defy any effort to interfere with their liberty of action. The lowest caste would co-operate with the highest to maintain existing conditions—because there is always some remaining caste which is lower even than the "lowest." That is one reason why the Indian masters of wisdom, although they do not approve of the caste system as it now exists, have never advocated its suppression by legislative enactment. They have concentrated their efforts upon the spiritual regeneration of the Indian people. To maintain that the caste system must inevitably make brotherly conduct impossible, is to deny to the Hindu his inalienable right to defy the laws of his caste if he deems it best to do so. He may suffer outwardly, it is true, for his unselfishness (supposing that his motive is unselfish); but does it necessarily follow that such suffering will be harmful?

In this country, where a different system of caste exists, we see no reason why caste should not treat caste in a brotherly way—not, perhaps, by eating out of the same dish, but by showing the most thoughtful consideration for the feelings of other people, no matter to what class they may belong.

Socialism, on the other hand, insists that caste should and must fight against caste, until one caste (the proletarian) subdues the

other. This doctrine was well expressed in the Platform adopted by the Socialist Party in National Convention at Chicago, in May, 1904—and Mr. Garver, in his pamphlet, accepts without qualification the principles and declarations of International Socialism. That platform announced that: "Between these two classes [the working class and the so-called capitalist class] there can be no possible compromise or identity of interests.... There can be no possible basis for social peace, for individual freedom, for mental and moral harmony, except in the conscious and complete triumph of the working class as the only class that has the right or power to be."

We take the liberty of considering that declaration to be not only untrue, but immoral. There is no reason why class should not co-operate with class. To deny the possibility is to create or to accentuate class hatred; is to work, not for Brotherhood, but against it. Further, individual freedom and mental and moral harmony do not depend for their existence upon outer conditions: they take their rise in the soul, and not in the body. Finally, under this head, "the conscious and complete triumph" of one caste over the other, of any caste over any other, would be quite as disastrous for the dominant caste as for those who have been triumphed over.

Like all other Socialists, Mr. Garver insists that environment makes the man; but he then diverges from the ordinary Socialist position by asserting that the term environment should not be limited to visible and material things or to conditions without or around us: it should include "all the subtle states or conditions *within* or invisible to us." This, we fear, is a contradiction in terms, and is therefore impossible. To speak of an environment as an inner condition is to speak of black being white. Environment means environment; and Theosophy, as D. R. T. reminded us, "holds that man makes environment." So here again we have a fundamental difference between the tenets of Socialism and those of the esoteric philosophy. And in case it may be supposed that Mr. Garver is not fairly representing Socialism, it may be well to point out that E. Belford Bax, perhaps the best known authority on Socialism in England, in his *Ethics of Socialism*, says that "according to Christianity and the ethics of religion of introspection generally, regeneration must come from within, must begin in the heart and mind of the individual. The ethic and religion of modern Socialism, on the contrary, look for regeneration from without, from material conditions and a higher social life. The ethic and religion of Socialism seek not the ideal society through the ideal individual, but, conversely, the ideal individual through the ideal society."

If the Socialist position were correct, it would follow that a tribe of simple, non-competitive South Sea Islanders, living an almost ideal existence so far as material conditions are concerned, should

serve as an example to such poor mortals as ourselves, whose fate it is to live in the stress and turmoil of industrial civilization. Yet we find these same Islanders in many cases to be cannibals, and in every case to be subject to passions and to unbrotherly feelings which painfully resemble our own! It is difficult to reconcile this fact with the theory that environment makes the man.

But because, according to Socialism, environment does make the man, we can understand, though we cannot accept, Mr. Garver's belief (*Socialism in Brief*) that earth can be made a paradise through the instrumentality of one class, "forced by economic conditions" to "abolish the present competitive system because they hope to better the condition of themselves, their wives and children," and instigated, as he says, by motives which are "purely selfish." It is much more difficult to understand the ability of Mr. Garver and of his fellow Socialists to ignore the lesson of history and the inevitable effect of their teaching upon those whom they remind so constantly of their Rights. Was not the French Revolution inspired by declarations of the alleged Rights of Man? Joseph Mazzini, Revolutionist though he was, pointed out long ago that no true and permanent reform can be based upon any such assertion. He looked for the day when some great movement would sweep the world, which would be promoted by a declaration of man's Duties. The same point is made, more argumentatively, by Professor Robert Flint, in his work on *Socialism*. Professor Flint does not dispute that rights are precious and sacred. He admits that often when we might forego them, if they were merely our own, we are bound in duty to assert and vindicate them, because they are also the rights of others. "In the course of the struggle for 'Rights,' great and indisputable services have been rendered to mankind." Nevertheless, the one supreme and guiding motive of life, whether personal or social, should not be that of Right, but of Duty. Only the man whose ruling conviction is that of Duty can be morally strong, self-consistent and noble; can control his own nature, conquer the world, sacrifice himself for others, and in all relations act as becomes a being in whose make-up there is so much that is truly and finely spiritual. Only a nation pervaded by a sense of the supremacy of duty, and by that recognition of the claims of self-denial and self-sacrifice for others, for ideal ends, and for great causes, which are involved in a sense of duty, can be one in which class properly co-operates with class for the good of the whole; in which individual and sectional interests, apparently conflicting, are successfully harmonized, and in which the citizens, notwithstanding all natural inequalities and all diversities of position and circumstance, form a true brotherhood.

Prof. Flint adds: "Tell men only of their Rights; tell them only that others are wronging them out of their Rights to liberty, to property, to power, to enjoyment, and that they must assert and secure their Rights; and you appeal, indeed, in some measure to their conscience, their sense of justice, *but you appeal as much or more to their selfishness, hate, envy, jealousy*; and if you infuse into them a certain strength to cast down and pull to pieces much which may deserve demolition, you render them unlikely to stop where they ought in the work of destruction, and utterly unfit them for the still more needed work of construction. Hence all revolutions which have been effected by men prejudiced and excited through such teaching, have been, even when essentially just, disgraced by shameful excesses, and only very partially, if at all, successful. Those who have gained Rights which they have been taught to think of as advantages, but not as responsibilities, always abuse them. No society in which men who have been thus perverted and misled are in the majority; no society in which the sense of Duty does not prevail, can fail to be one in which class is at constant war with class; can enjoy peace, security, or prosperity."

Turning now to the question of religion, Mr. Garver protests vehemently against the statement by D. R. T. that "the ethics of Socialism precludes belief in the immortality of the soul." Yet he will not deny that every celebrated exponent of the Socialist philosophy, such as Karl Marx, Engels, Dr. Averling, Bebel, Bax, has been an avowed atheist. Engels declared that "religion is nothing but the fantastic reflection in the brains of men of those powers [economic and industrial] by which their daily existence is dominated; a reflection in which natural forces assume supernatural forms" (*Dührings Umwälzung der Wissenschaft*). Marx, in his criticism of the early Socialist platform, demanded that the labor party declare its intention of "delivering men's consciences from the spectre of religion." Bebel, the present leader of the German Socialists, was not contradicted by his fellow Socialists in the Reichstag when he announced that "in politics we profess republicanism; in economics, socialism; in religion, atheism." Nor is this unanimity accidental. It results from the fact that the philosophy of Socialism is based upon materialistic premises. Logically, the whole superstructure of Socialism would fall to the ground if it were not admitted, in the somewhat explicit language of Büchner, that the brain secretes thought as the liver secretes bile, and that the religious, ethical and political ideals of humanity have been merely the secretions of economic processes.

It is true that there are those who call themselves Christian Socialists, and that we should perhaps grant them the right to regard

incompatible things as consistent, if they choose to do so. Nevertheless, as Professor Flint, in the work already quoted, points out: "What is called Christian Socialism will always be found to be either un-Christian in so far as it is Socialistic, or unsocialistic in so far as it is truly and fully Christian."

So-called "Christian Socialists" frequently try to defend their position by appealing to the honored names and high standing of Charles Kingsley, Maurice, and others, who described their doctrines many years ago as "Christian Socialism." But neither Maurice nor Kingsley held a single principle or doctrine of Marxism or of any other variety of modern Socialism. When they maintained that social reorganization must be preceded by individual reformation; that trust in State aid or legislation is a superstition; that self-help is the prime requisite for the amelioration of the condition of the working classes; that co-operation should be voluntary and accompanied by appropriate education; that so far from private property being robbery, it is a divine stewardship; and that men can never be joined in true brotherhood by mere plans to give them self-interest in common, but must first feel that they have one common Father:—they were not advocating, they were denouncing practically every tenet of modern Socialism.

Archdeacon Cunningham, in an address delivered at the Church Congress held at Great Yarmouth, England, in 1907, presented the positive side of Professor Flint's criticism. He said that the doctrine of Christ, as contrasted with the ideals of modern Socialists, has a spiritual character, and is also of immediate practical applicability in every condition of place and time, so that it has a true universality, which Socialism has not and never can have. Christ sets before us an example of the constant effort to carry out His Father's will in all the relations of life; the consciousness of His Father's presence was with him unceasingly, and affected his whole attitude, not only towards his fellowmen, but towards the animate creation and the inanimate, too; and yet He does not seem to have formulated any "social ideal" as to the distribution of property. He did not need any such scheme to aid Him in His work. And all these 1900 years, throughout the whole world, wherever the Gospel has been preached, it has been possible for every human being—slave or free, man or woman—to try to guide his conduct by the two great principles of Christian duty in regard to economic life; on the one hand, to regard all his property and talents as a trust committed to him by God, and to be administered, not irresponsibly, but as the terms of the trust require; and secondly, to fulfil the duty of work—of trying to give effect, by personal exercise of mind or body, to the will of God. If we are in earnest, said the Archdeacon, in trying to mould our lives after this model, and in accordance with these principles, the

destruction of the existing social order, and the devising of a new system, will seem to be surplusage; not a thing we feel to be a help. Of these Christian principles it may at least be said that they are not specially modern and are not merely ideal. In fact, Archdeacon Cunningham might have added that they long antedated Christianity, and that to go no further afield than the well-known religions of India or the philosophies of Greece, will supply us with similar statements of the spiritual as opposed to the materialistic interpretation of life.

The truth is that Socialism, being based upon materialism, takes for granted a scale of values which is misleading, and which was shown to be misleading centuries ago by Zeno and other Greek philosophers—more specifically by Hecaton in his treatise on the Chief Good, and by Chrysippus in his treatise on Pleasure—whose views have been preserved for us by Diogenes Laërtius. They divided existing things into good, bad, and indifferent. The good are the virtues, such as prudence, justice, courage, temperance, knowledge; the bad are the contraries, folly, intemperance, cowardice, injustice, etc. The indifferent, "which are neither beneficial nor injurious," are life, health, pleasure, beauty, physical strength, riches, a good reputation, nobility of birth, and their contraries, death, disease, disgrace, weakness, poverty, a bad reputation, low birth, etc.

"For, as it is the property of the hot to warm and not to chill one, so it is the property of the good to benefit and not to injure one. Now, wealth and good health cannot be said to benefit any more than to injure any one: therefore, neither wealth nor good health, is 'a good.' Again, they [the Stoics] say that that thing is not good which it is possible to use both well and ill. But it is possible to make either a good or a bad use of wealth, or of health; therefore, wealth and good health are not 'goods.'"

The Socialists do not realize this. Consciously or unconsciously they consider health and pleasure and personal comfort to be things good in themselves; and disease and poverty and other forms of discomfort to be evils in themselves. They overlook the fact that these things, at best, are merely means to an end—no more good in themselves than electricity or some other colorless force in nature which cannot possibly be described as either good or evil, except it be used for good or evil purposes by man himself. Incidentally, the Christian Scientists make exactly the same mistake, Christian Science and Socialism, philosophically, being opposite expressions of one and the same delusion.

It would not be wise in this day and generation to push the stoicism of Zeno too far. But among Theosophists, or students of Theosophy, it may not be out of place to recall a letter which was published many years ago in *Lucifer* (Vol. II, p. 432), in which "that

curse known as the 'struggle for life,'" was spoken of as "the real and most prolific parent of most woes and sorrows, and all crimes." The writer of the letter continued: "Why has that struggle become the almost universal scheme of the universe? We answer: Because no religion, with the exception of Buddhism, has hitherto taught a practical contempt for this earthly life, while each of them, always with that one solitary exception, has through its hells and damnations, inculcated the greatest dread of death.... Teach the people to see that life on this earth, even the happiest, is but a burden and an illusion, that it is but our own Karma, the cause producing the effect, that is our own judge, our saviour in future lives—and the great struggle for life will soon lose its intensity."

Experience has proved that it would be impossible for the average American or European to entertain genuinely any such "practical contempt for this earthly life" as the writer of the above suggests. But at least we need not fall into the mistake of defending philosophically a table of values so hopelessly misleading as that which the Socialists endorse.

Finally, we are assured by Mr. Garver that "no Theosophist need fear that Socialism will impede his spiritual unfoldment." We trust that what has been said above will convince Mr. Garver that no Theosophist fears any such thing. Our opposition to Socialism is not based on personal grounds. We venture to defy the ingenuity of any Socialistic government to create conditions in which spiritual unfoldment cannot take place. But while our indifference is sincere so far as Theosophists are concerned, we readily admit that it would be well within the power of a Socialist commonwealth to create conditions in which the orderly spiritual unfoldment of the majority of mankind would be retarded. That is one reason why we devote time and space to the consideration of a question which would not otherwise concern us. The other reason is that, even at present, much energy is being diverted from useful and constructive work, to activities which are either harmful or futile, as a result of Socialist propaganda. In the address by Archdeacon Cunningham, already quoted, he pointed out that a political scheme which claims attention as a panacea, or as an ideal, is likely to concentrate public attention and to become obstructive. Whilst the fascination and enthusiasm last, nothing else can get a hearing. In England, some sixty years ago, there was a great discussion in regard to the advantages of small holdings and allotments. A select committee of the House of Commons brought in a most admirable report, in which they distinguished the conditions and circumstances in which small holdings were likely to be a success from those in which they had proved a failure. A Bill was prepared to try to meet the great want of rural

England; but it got little support, and had to be dropped. It never took hold of the public. At that time the great struggle over the Corn Laws was going on; Free Trade was put forward as an ideal, and the harbinger of universal peace and prosperity. Small holdings and allotments did not seem worth consideration; the project of promoting them could only, as was said in the House of Commons, tend to raise delusive hopes. Why should they adopt a "doubtful expedient when a remedy was before them, whose efficacy nobody questioned?" England has had sixty years of Free Trade, and there are very few people who, after that experience, regard it as a panacea now, in the absolute sense. The exaggerated enthusiasm for it helped to delay a much-needed practical reform; and after sixty years England is falling back on that so-called doubtful remedy. But, continued the Archdeacon, there was far more excuse in the circumstances of England in 1843 for trusting to Free Trade as a panacea than there now is for committing ourselves unhesitatingly to modern Socialism in any of its forms. Those who recognize the good intention of modern social idealists may yet regard modern social ideals with alarm, partly because they seem likely to prove injurious to the community generally and to the poor in particular, partly because they distract men from engaging steadily in humble but practical reforms. We ought to reckon up, not only the possible mischief which may be done, but also the harm that arises from the delay of real improvements, before we begin to play with this sort of fire.

Practically, therefore, on behalf of good government and "the next step," as well as in the special light of Theosophy, which shows us a *perversion of spiritual energy intended for other and better purposes*—there is good reason why the QUARTERLY, not as representing the Theosophical Society, but merely on its own account and with the approval of many old students, should call attention to the dangers of Socialism, and should assert once more its faith in the Soul as the one means and path by which humanity can reach at last to the kingdom of power and glory and peace.

T.

DISCIPLINE.

THE disciple moved swiftly forward with unhurried grace, opening and closing doors with perfect silence, the gentle foot-falls of his sandled feet making no trace to the ear as he passed by. He had been taught that noise, noise of any kind, was an occult sin. The building was not a very large one, and he soon came to his master's room. He rapped gently on the door and waited expectantly, but there was no answer. He had been told to knock but once, and then stand by the door until he was bidden to enter, being sure to listen attentively for the response from within. Often, it had been explained to him, his master might be much occupied with important affairs requiring undivided attention.

He was tired, for he had been on a difficult mission which had required the fullest exercise of all his powers, but he was filled with that delightful sense of finished work well done, and this had kept his spirits high and had caused him to forget or ignore his fatigue. But now, standing and waiting, he had opportunity to realize how very tired he was, and he found himself hoping that it would not be long before his master bid him enter. Then he checked this thought as undutiful and ungracious and deliberately forced himself to wish that if his continued fatigue and patient waiting could in any wise serve his master's convenience, he was only too glad to render homage in such ways.

The minutes passed by slowly and still no word came from within. He had been taught to curb all restless movements and to stand or sit entirely motionless; for unnecessary physical action was a waste of force, and waste of any kind a sin; but, perhaps because of his fatigue, perhaps because of the reaction after his recent exertions, he found it very difficult to avoid little shiftings of his feet, or motions of his hands. He wanted to stand first on one foot and then on another so as to relieve them of his weight. It required a strong effort of his will to curb this physical restlessness. Remembering the many injunctions which he had received during his years of training, however, he finally conquered the nervous impulses which disturbed him, and stood serene and calm.

Then it occurred to him that perhaps his master had not heard his knock. This had never happened in his experience, it is true, but his brain put forth the idea, and followed it with all sorts of insidious suggestions and excuses. "Had he not just returned from the successful performance of his master's work, and was it not his

duty to report as soon as possible? Perhaps some important combination was at that moment waiting for the result of his mission? Although he had been told never to knock but once, did not the circumstances justify an exception to the general rule?"

When these thoughts first occurred, he dismissed them with impatience as unworthy of his training, and forced his attention into other channels. As his mind was tired, he tried to rest it by repeating extracts from the sacred books which he had learned by heart, by prayer, by meditation. An hour or more passed in this wise.

He grew more and more tired, and he began to feel the need of food. He wondered whether it would not be permissible for him to sit down, as he could listen for his summons in that position as well as while standing upright. The mere idea of sitting seemed to increase his fatigue and his physical restlessness returned with doubled vigor. But his conscience told him that he had been directed to knock gently and then *stand* until summoned to enter. He knew that his only safety lay in implicit obedience, for never in his entire experience had he failed to make a grievous blunder when he acted contrary to any instructions he had received.

With a great effort he again dominated his bodily sensations, but it was not so easy to control his mind. He remembered many stories of disciples who had had their common sense and individual initiative tested, and he wondered whether this might not, perhaps, be a case where he was expected to use his discretion and act as his own wisdom dictated. But a moment's reflection told him that if he disobeyed the injunctions he had received, it would be because he was tired and impatient, and not because of any urging from his inner self.

In a sudden panic he wondered suddenly whether his master might after all have bidden him enter, and he, absorbed in some of the thoughts which had from time to time occupied his attention, or with the struggles to control his body and his brain, had failed to hear. His heart sank at the thought of the grave discourtesy which this would be, but reflection again comforted him, for he knew that even when most occupied with the effort to dominate his lower nature, he had always had a portion of his consciousness listening for the answer to his knock.

He heard the faint rustle of approaching footsteps and looking up, saw a fellow disciple walking down the corridor. Instantly his brain suggested that here might be a means of relief. Although all unnecessary talk between disciples was strictly forbidden, except during the hour for recreation and conversation, he wondered whether he would not be justified in asking for advice, perhaps for food, which he could eat while still standing waiting. Could he not at

least ask whether his master was within, for it suddenly occurred to him that perhaps the delay was caused by his master's absence. But as fast as these several queries arose in his mind, the obvious answer to them followed, and he silently returned the grave salutation of his friend. A wave of sympathy, a sense of support and refreshment, swept over him with the greeting, and aided him in regaining his poise.

As a reaction from his effort at self-control, his fatigue and hunger and impatience returned with redoubled force and it required the exercise of his fullest will to dominate once more the activities of his body and brain. But he succeeded and again tried to occupy himself with devotional and inner exercises. It was only with great effort that he could control his mind and concentrate his attention. Time and time again he found himself thinking of accidental and detached subjects, found his mental activity inconsequent and drifting aimlessly, found that he had lost that perfect control of the operation of his brain which is enjoined upon all disciples, which, indeed, is a *sine qua non* of discipleship. He realized that he was getting into a deplorable and even dangerous condition. The thought steadied him and braced his will. Were a little physical fatigue and standing before a door for a few hours all that were needed to derange his years of self-discipline and training? A strong feeling of contempt arose within him, and with it came the warm glow of his returning inner power. His physical sensations melted away from the field of his consciousness and his reawakened and reinvigorated will asserted its mastery over his mind and body. An hour or more passed.

Once again his attention was attracted to approaching footsteps and looking up, he saw coming towards him one of the elder brothers, a friend and comrade of his master. Again there surged up in him the hope that this interruption might be the means of bringing him relief, and this hope was intensified when the erect and noble figure turned towards him, and with a gracious smile and a friendly and encouraging remark, knocked at his master's door. Instantly came the reply to enter. For a desperate moment he thought of going in too, but controlled the impulse almost before it was framed in his mind. The mere temporary propinquity of the master reinvigorated and stimulated his flagging courage and will, but after the door was once more closed, his spirits sank, and a wave of self-pity passed over him.

Thoughts, unbidden, and almost disloyal to his master arose in his mind. Was it fair to put such a trial upon him, for after all he was but one of the younger disciples. Perhaps his master had forgotten that he was there? Would the elder brother who had just

entered chance to speak of him? As fast as these thoughts formed in his mind he dismissed them, sometimes with self-contempt that he could think such things, sometimes almost with a sense of fear that his endurance would fail him, for the presence of such ideas was an indication that his will and moral fibre were deteriorating. Had anything ever happened in all his experience to justify for one instant the thought that his master was capable of the least unkindness, or unfairness, or anything but the utmost solicitude and love. He knew the answer, and again forced such reflections from his mind.

After half an hour or so the door opened silently and the elder brother passed through. This time he did not speak, but the effect of his presence again caused a sense of refreshment and renewed strength and hope. The disciple wondered whether, now that his master had been interrupted in whatever work he had been doing, he might not call him in, so he concentrated all his attention to listen for the hoped for summons. But minute after minute passed and no word came. In time his effort of attention relaxed somewhat and his mind again began to bubble forth all kinds of fragmentary thoughts. He was too tired to stop it, and for awhile contented himself with checking any thought which had an element of danger, which might be tinged with disloyalty, or self-pity, or other manifestations of his lower nature.

Finally he realized that this would never do, and again summoning his inner powers of will and faith and habit, he controlled his thoughts and forced them into safe and accustomed channels. He was helped in this by his pride. He determined that he would not be beaten by a thing so low as physical fatigue, or so insignificant as a few hours wait beside a door. What chance had he to succeed in his further evolution, what kind of a helper would he be, what sort of an instrument for his master's service, if he were beaten by such ignoble trials. He hated himself for the weakness he had already shown, for the wavering of his will, for the feebleness of his hold upon himself, for the laxity of his self-control, and for another hour or two he kept his tone high by reflecting upon the tests of other men so much more difficult than this, which they had lived through with little or no disturbance of their serenity. But he grew more and more tired. Twenty-four hours had passed since he had had food and then he had eaten very lightly. He had been almost constantly on his feet ever since, part of the time climbing over rough mountain roads, and much of the time occupied with difficult and delicate negotiations. He wondered whether his master realized how difficult they had been?

He wondered whether his master realized how tired he was, how he needed food and sleep, how difficult it had been to wait

patiently before the door all these weary hours, and then he thrust these thoughts from him as unworthy; for deep down in his inner consciousness he knew that his master must know all these things, must know his every thought, must feel his slightest sensation of fatigue, must know his weakness and his recent failures properly to control his mind, must have seen and read his disloyal thoughts, know of his self-pity, see all his childish hopes and fears. And as he felt the full import of all these things, an overmastering wave of love and gratitude welled up from his inmost being, gratitude that, in spite of all these faults and weaknesses and failures, his master was still his master, was willing to accept and guide and train and discipline him. His heart burned with a deep sense of gratitude and devotion. He saw with clear vision how necessary it was that he should have just the kind of test which he was then undergoing in order that these faults and imperfections should become apparent to him, and from the depths of a full heart there welled up a wave of loyal love that he should be so favored.

Instantly he heard his master's voice. "Enter, my son." Controlling his physical weakness as best he could, he opened the door, passed through, and closing it gently behind him, made the accustomed salutation. His master looked up from his writing and although he did not speak, the disciple's whole being thrilled with the sense of protection, love, encouragement, complete recognition and understanding of all he had been through, which he read in the luminous eyes which were gazing at him. He had to restrain an impulse to throw himself at his master's feet and kiss the hem of his robe. His fatigue, his impatience, his self-pity, the last trace of bitterness and pain, melted away from his heart. Even his contempt and regret for his own weakness disappeared. Then the master spoke: "You need food and rest. Seek these and return here later."

"But the results of my mission? May I not make my report?" queried the disciple, eagerly.

"Unfortunately, your mission was a failure. I have spent the last eight hours, while you waited outside the door, undoing the results of your mistakes. Go now, my son: return when you are rested and I will explain the matter to you."

And the disciple departed instantly, lost in wonder and deeply pondering.

MEN-TEK-NIS.

THE DESIRES OF HANUFIN.

HANUFIN stood on the shore of the great sea. Around him were all those things which have life and form, the things which the gods had brought forth from the great chaos.

At his feet beat the waves of the sea, the chaos from which the gods called things forth. In his heart Hanufin envied the gods, he desired their power, he would be as they. He lifted up his voice and cried out unto the gods: "Make me a creator!" he said. The god Torso, "He of the Beard," heard him, and came at his call. "Teach me to create, oh, venerable one. Make me a god!" said Hanufin.

The god, Torso, sprang into the sea, the great chaos; from its depths he brought a single drop of water, which he laid in the palm of Hanufin's hand. "Breathe upon it the Inner Breath," said he and then disappeared.

But Hanufin knew nought of the Inner Breath; he held the water-drop in his hand and looked upon it in wonder. The sun shone on the water-drop and licked it up, and then cried Hanufin: "Come, come, the sun hath stolen my water-drop!"

Again appeared "He of the Beard" and from the sea brought another water-drop to Hanufin's hand, saying: "Breathe upon it the Inner Breath."

Then did Hanufin cunningly knead the water-drop into a pinch of clay. "It will save it until I find the Inner Breath," said he. But the wind blew upon it and dried it and, seeing this, Hanufin cried again: "Come, come, the wind hath stolen my water-drop!"

Again came Torso, and once more brought a water-drop from the depths of the sea to Hanufin's hand. "Breathe upon it the Inner Breath," said he.

Then did Hanufin quickly breathe upon the water-drop, but with the Outer Breath, for of the Inner Breath he knew nought. And forth from the water-drop came a monster, having the head of a beast and the voice of a man, and Hanufin, affrighted, threw the thing from him into the sea.

Again appeared Torso. "Thou hast mocked the gods," said he, "thou hast brought forth a monster! In striving for the wisdom of the gods thou hast uncovered the art of devils. The gods demand thy light!" He then took from Hanufin the power of seeing and Hanufin, in his blindness, stumbled and fell into the sea, into the great chaos.

In his struggles Hanufin breathed to the right of him and to

the left of him in the great sea. He breathed with the Outer Breath, and from each water-drop that received it came a monster having the head of a beast and the voice of a man. And the monsters which he thus created cried out to him to come, and he, being blind, followed. Hither and thither was Hanufin led by these creatures in the sea; they were senseless and their calls were without point, but insistent. When Hanufin grew weary and would rest their cries rose louder, they gathered about him and forced him onward without rest or reason.

At last Hanufin cried to the gods for deliverance; he acknowledged their power. Again came "He of the Beard" and gave back to Hanufin his power of sight. And when he was no longer blind Hanufin looked about him; he was encompassed by a cloud of monsters. He shrank from them, they followed; he cast them from him, they clung to him: "Free me from these, oh, Torso!" he cried despairingly.

"I cannot," said Torso. "Breathe upon them the Inner Breath."

"Give me the Inner Breath!" pleaded Hanufin.

"I cannot. I never had It!" answered "He of the Beard."

"Help me to find It, that I may rid myself of these monsters!" prayed Hanufin.

"They are your creations, your children. Neither gods nor devils can live apart from their creations," said Torso.

"Pity me!" cried Hanufin. "Must I forever dwell with monsters?"

"Breathe upon them the Inner Breath," said Torso. "Make them beautiful!"

"Thou art not a wise one, thou canst only confuse!" cried Hanufin. "What shall I do to solve this fear?"

"Breathe upon it the Inner Breath," said Torso. "Thou hast envied the gods, find the source of thine envy."

So Hanufin sat in silence. He sought the place from which his envy came. He merged his senses in his eyes and beheld only the monsters which he had created. He withdrew to the chambers of his head and found therein Torso and his oft-repeated command. He entered into his heart and found his envy; back of it lay a new power. "It is the Inner Breath!" cried Hanufin, joyfully.

Then forth from his heart came Hanufin bringing the new power, the Inner Breath. He mingled with his monsters and upon each he breathed with the Inner Breath, and, lo, each became a beautiful thing, like those shapen by the gods.

"Thou hast become a god!" said Torso to Hanufin. "I am thy mind, therefore I will dwell in thy head and serve thee forever."

So, to this day, Hanufin lives in peace amid his creations in the great sea.

F. A. BRUCE.

THEOSOPHY AS AN INFLUENCE IN LIFE.

THOSE who study the meaning of the word "Theosophy" soon discover that it means Divine Wisdom, or knowledge about God; that is to say, the Truth in regard to Divine things.

But as all that is, all that pertains to Life, is in essence Divine and of Divine origin, it follows that the Truth is latent in all things; so that as we seek for the Truth in and about everything, we are to that extent Truthseekers, or seekers after the Divine in all things—hence "theosophists."

In this way it comes about that a true theosophist is never a partisan; the ideal theosophist is he who is impartial, just, courteous, seeking only to find the underlying Truth in all departments of Life and Being, and granting to others the same right. He knows that he of himself is not now able to know the whole Truth of Life—that vast theme—but some aspects only, among innumerable aspects. So he will be found listening to the voices of his fellow-seekers, who can enrich his knowledge concerning the Truths of Being, by that which they, in their turn, have found.

Theosophy is thus seen to be a matter of religion, since it treats of our relations, as human beings, to the Soul of Life—the Truth. It is a religion which is no mere formality, for it becomes the central keynote in our lives and extends to the most minute details of daily life. Since in each such detail we seek the right and true way to meet it, we do apply our knowledge as we find it, and in this sense, if truly applied, Theosophy becomes the paramount influence in life.

Being knowledge, as well as religion, it is a religion which does not oppose science, but the two are combined so as to include the whole of Life on both the material and the spiritual aspects; in it and through it man learns how he lives and moves and has his being.

Man learns that he is in the process of ever becoming; that Life—even for him—has no beginning and no ending, and that the great Law is one of perpetual evolution—of evolution, not merely in physical existence, but also in the unfoldment of the mental and spiritual aspects of his consciousness.

Theosophy is not a dogma or a series of dogmatic propositions invented by man; nor is it a matter of revelation in the usual meaning of that word. As man evolves, as his consciousness expands, through the search for and the study of Truth, so he becomes wiser; his knowledge deepens; and more and more his life becomes a process

of showing forth and manifesting that Divine source of which his Soul is a part. Thus the Wisdom Religion—or Theosophy—is the one and only vital factor in his life. It includes knowledge of the laws which govern both the seen and the unseen; it includes the laws which govern the evolution of the physical, astral, psychical and intellectual constituents of nature and of man; it leads to the practical application of the spiritual laws which are above and beyond all, and within all as well.

The ordinary experience of man includes but a portion of universal experience; the evidence of the ordinary senses extends only to a given distance. But just as these can be developed by certain individuals to an extension which is marvellous to the ordinary man, so can man's consciousness be developed and extended until it embraces the knowledge of the realms which have been mentioned above. That knowledge is only truly attained when the seeker has found it within himself, when he has found it and lived by its dawning light, putting it to use in all the phases of his daily life and consciousness. Theosophy knows that nature includes the visible and the invisible; that all is under the dominion of law, and that the apparently mysterious is not unsolvable, but is merely the operation of law which is not for the time within the consciousness of the ordinary man.

Demonstration of all that Theosophy shows as to the nature and laws of the universe or man, is quite beyond the scope of the present article. There are certain salient features as to which the great mass of students are agreed. The constitution of man is one such feature; its subdivisions have been roughly grouped under the heads of Body, Soul, Spirit.

BODY. This is not immortal. It is subject to the processes known to us as growth, decay, death. These we can (and do) increase and retard to some extent. Even here we are continually discovering new laws, or new applications of old laws which markedly influence our daily life.

SOUL. Save in the case of very determined "materialists," there is a very general belief in the idea that man has a soul, and that this soul is immortal. Most religious systems teach the same. But Theosophy puts forward that immortality precedes the present existence, just as it follows it; further, that such continued existence is governed by law, by the steady operation of cause and effect from one existence to another, operating through many lives. This law is expressed in the words that as a man sows, so shall he reap. The idea of the soul and its continuous existence becomes a very potent factor in the life of a man. For this law is set in motion by each one for himself. No one else does it for him. Events do not take

place by accident, but according to the principle that action and reaction are equal and opposite in direction. This principle is applicable in the moral world quite as much as in the physical domain. The outcome of this is that the Law of Evolution is applicable to the soul as well as the body; that the soul grows, and that here man is the builder, the evolver and the destroyer of the soul. A whole vista of possibilities opens out before him who discerns this truth and who sees by its light the larger opportunities of a life greater than the ordinary. In such considerations Theosophy opens out an enormous influence before the mind and heart of a man.

SPIRIT. The immortal Universal Essence. In place of the devotion of aims and ambitions of a material kind—the care of the body, the accumulation of wealth and the gain of power, the cultivation of the purely intellectual faculties and the senses—the center of consciousness is transferred; in place of seeking after more or less transitory results we have the cultivation of the Soul, its attributes, powers and life. Discernment between the mortal and the immortal is now the vital factor in the life of the man who sees that his is the choice.

Theosophy brings to man a clearer knowledge of the conditions under which he lives his present life. It shows him that these conditions are governed by his actions and thoughts in former lives and that his past and the present will continue to govern his future lives. His present embodiment is not the only one, but may be compared to one day of his greater life. As a human being he must see to it that his life is lived as a human being, and not as a mere animal. He must preserve his self-respect, occupy his own place and follow the laws of his own evolution in the scale of Being.

The faculty of self-consciousness is that which man has of his own, that which is peculiar to himself as Man. Once he perceives this fact he can no more turn back to the merely animal faculties without the sacrifice of his birthright. His Soul, his true Self it is, which is on its way to self-consciousness within him, and his life must be lived in obedience to the laws of the Soul—which has a nature and law of its own—if he would evolve to his high and rightful place in the scale of the universe. The study of Theosophy brings to him an increasing knowledge of these laws; could there be a greater and more lasting influence in life? It has been said that the universe exists for the manifestation of the purposes of the Soul. Progress therefore depends upon living the life of the Soul. But there must necessarily be differences in the devotion with which this purpose is carried out. There are gradations of devotion and gradations of soul evolution. As Huxley wrote, just so much as a human being is evolved beyond a black beetle, so there may be grades of super-humanity who have evolved the full consciousness of the Soul. These

are the Elder Brothers, the Masters of Wisdom whom Theosophy reveals to the world, and in whom so many theosophists believe. The existence of these "just men made perfect" is the logical consequence of the evolution of the Soul. This truth serves as an incentive to effort, for since they have accomplished the evolution which we are taught is the one thing worth accomplishing in life, it follows that every man may achieve it, since the Masters were once men like ourselves.

There is a law which governs the animal world—the law of the struggle for life. By this law of the individual unit struggling upwards in material conditions, has come the general evolution. But when the life of the Soul begins, the scale is altered, the expression of this law becomes transmuted and we then have the struggle for the lives of others. Self is sacrificed, and the Greater Self, or Soul Unity, now becomes the leading law. The universal Brotherhood of the Soul is now the dominant keynote, and it is this law which Theosophy puts forward as its guiding principle. This high influence in life has to come forward in consciousness—to come forward in the daily, the hourly life of a man, and life has to be lived in accordance with it, despite the lower influences of material conditions. Selfishness is the common law of material conditions; altruism is the law of the Soul. That Soul can and will transmute the lower law as it is expressed in daily life. Here again is a profound influence in life which Theosophy brings to man.

Briefly to review what Theosophy has brought before human consideration, there is:

1. The incentive to effort. Each human being fashions his own destiny under the law of Karma—action and reaction.

2. The law of re-embodiment gives him the opportunity of thus working out his own salvation, together with a long period of choice.

3. Evolution as introduced to the world by Darwin gives us the idea of evolution as a law governing the physical world. His broad and impersonal presentation cast a fresh light upon both science and religion, for his was an essentially religious mind. But when Theosophy completed the evolutionary scheme by bringing forward its spiritual aspect, the involution and evolution of the Soul at once gave us the hope of satisfying the whole of our being, and not merely one part of it; in the place of the incentive of material reward we have that of gaining the "kingdom of heaven," as well as that of helping the whole of humanity.

4. Theosophy did not merely put forward the existence of the Soul. Many religions have done that. But the teaching has been overlaid with dogma and superstition, so that Theosophy conferred a deep obligation upon mankind when it reminded us afresh of the

possibility of Soul evolution, and in addition pointed out to us anew that by living the life of the Soul man shall come to understand the doctrine. Jesus spoke to the multitude in parables, the parables of the Kingdom. In these, to the world, the practical teachings were hinted at, while to the disciples who were necessarily pledged to the life, the practical results were not merely demonstrated but were brought into their conscious perception.

5. Death, the dreaded terror, sinks to nothing, because man's consciousness is centered in the Soul and concerns itself with what is above the change and is hence unaffected by that change. Such changes are always going on in the body and the change which we call death is only a sign-post on the road of the greater life and leads to another and a greater opportunity. For Life is eternal and immortal; always and everywhere there is Life, world without end.

6. Theosophy gives to man the responsibility of his thoughts and acts, gives him vast opportunities of understanding and of work; above all it presents him with the principle of association in the great endeavour, with examples of the result in those who have attained—saints, seers and martyrs all, the Sons of the Great Brotherhood. It enlightens our understanding of the vexations and trials of our ordinary life, and shows us both joy and sorrow as being but the dual aspect of the one great factor—Opportunity, the opportunity to evolve through effort, self-sacrifice and self-discipline. It demonstrates that all our vexations, disappointments and trials are intended to teach us the necessity of turning our attention and our hearts from material things to those of the spiritual world. But life does not therefore become drab-coloured and dark, a matter merely for resignation, so that all happiness and gladness depart. By no means. Through the dark portals of the death of the personal, selfish part of our nature, do we pass to enter into each new form of life—our true life—the life of the Soul.

These, to many students, are the main teachings of that universal Truth which, in this, our era, has been re-christened Theosophy.

ARCHIBALD KEIGHTLEY.

THE RELIGION OF THE WILL.*

THE WILL IN THE SOUL.

II. DESIRE.

WE are using the word Soul here in the sense in which it is used by St. Paul, where, speaking of man's invisible nature, he divides that nature into Soul and Spirit. He thus makes Soul, not the final immortal, but the middle term between Body and Spirit; the Psychical Man, to use Paul's own phrase. Paul further teaches, in the fifteenth chapter of his first letter to his disciples in Corinth, that this middle nature, the psychical man, is the battle-ground in which is fought out the great fight, from victory in which arises the spiritual man, the true Immortal.

We therefore use Soul in the Pauline sense, as the middle term between Body and Spirit. We tried to show that the first essential property of the psychical man is the mirroring power, the power to reflect, and to retain, images of things seen by the eyes, heard by the ears, perceived by the senses. And we tried to show that, as a first-fruit of this image-making power, we have memory, the gradual gathering of a great collection, a gallery of mind-pictures, painted, as it were, on the psychic canvas, and spread out, one by one, before the observing consciousness. The first definite power of the Will in the Soul is the power to paint these mind-images, and, with this, the power to call up one picture or another, as the will may determine; to hold that picture in the field of view so long as may be desired; and to dismiss it and replace it with another picture, when we so desire.

Further, we tried to show that we have a power of selection and arrangement, whereby we may bring up at once all the mind images of some one class of objects, and lay them one upon another, like the negatives of a composite photograph. We took as our illustration the mind-images of apples, and showed how, by superimposing the images of red, yellow, green and brown, we come at the general notion of an apple, in the abstract; and thus take the first step in purely mental or intellectual action.

Lastly, we tried to show that, in all intellectual action, there are two elements: first, the arranging of the mind-pictures, and, secondly the decision of the intuition, which sits as judge upon the parties thus brought up to the bar of justice. This intuition, this

power to pronounce on real values, is akin to Will, and always goes with an exercise of the will, namely the will to know the truth. It is, further, the apparition of a power from above, meeting the power from below, the power to assemble the mind-images and marshal them in order. But even in the marshalling there must be a certain intuition, the recognition of a certain common factor, an underlying identity between them. In this way, it seemed to us, all our mental or purely intellectual life is built up; first by the marshalling of mind-images, and then by the pronouncement of the intuition, the sense of real values, the sense of truth.

Now we are ready to take a further step in advance. So far, it will be noticed, we have spoken of the mind-images as if they were quiescent, as if they were static, and lay calmly in the still vision of the mind, like reflections on a tranquil lake. But this impersonal quiescence is not the common experience of humanity; it belongs rather to a high degree of development and self-mastery, and is only to be attained by arduous work. We abstracted a certain very important element, for the sake of simplicity, and in order to bring out one side of the truth. But what ordinarily happens is something quite different from that quiet and impersonal action of the intellect. A quite different force enters into the action of the psychical man; and this force we may illustrate in some such way as this:

Let us suppose our readers have a weakness for the pleasures of taste, a habit of enjoying, let us say, candy or cigarettes. Let us take this habit as the subject of an experiment. Let us suppose, kind reader, that you buy a box of some kind of candy of which you are particularly fond; something that attracts the eye, and has a pleasant perfume as well as a luscious flavor. Take your box of candies, open it, consider well the fair form, the tempting perfume; and, having duly prepared the mind by the arts of anticipation, take one candy, lay it on your tongue, press it tenderly against your palate, and enjoy it to the full, letting your mind rest on what you are doing.

Now for our illuminating experiment. You have formed your mind-image. Now give it an opportunity to reveal something more of its true nature. Take your still almost untouched box of candies, look once more longingly at its contents, with due deliberation savoring their perfume, and then set it out of reach and out of sight, on some high shelf within a moderate distance.

Now take some dry book, a page of dull description, or some not very interesting narrative of drab and undistinguished persons, and set yourself to read it, leisurely, calmly, without undue pressure of thought and will. You read. Line after line is traced by the

carefully moving eyes, and word after word makes its faint imprint on your thought. Presently you are conscious of a slight pull in the other direction. What was it? Yes—there was something agreeable. It was—the candy, whose cherished flavor still lingers in the mind. You put the mind-image away, and set yourself to read once more. Once more the faint pull comes at your attention. You can turn your thought to it, and let the attention, no longer held by your reading, rest upon the mind-image of the candy, and warm it into new life. And then you can do one of two things. You can either obey the prompting of the candy-mind-image, rise and take down your box of candy for further practical study; or you can use the will's power over the mind-images, set that particular image resolutely aside, and go on firmly and steadily with your reading, till you have mastered your theme, in spite of its dryness.

Needless to say, just the same experiment may be made with cigarettes. And if it should happen that any one among the readers of this study have at any time determined to break themselves of the cigarette habit, such can testify to the pulling and drawing power exercised on them, and, we doubt not, triumphantly conquered, when the mind-image of a cigarette, fragrant, soothing, gently stimulative of pleasing dreams, obtrudes itself winsomely and alluringly in the midst of some piece of hard task-work, taken up, perchance, as a defense against the wiles of the smoke fairy.

These are slight and trifling instances of a grave and tremendous power. For to the fact that the mind image is not static, as we at first treated it, but dynamic, is due the character and force of a whole period of human life. Indeed, if we rightly understand it, to this very property of the mind-image, the psychic image in the mind, is due that whole development which has transformed mere animal life in its moral simplicity into the vast complexity of human life, which is too often neither simple nor moral. If we rightly understand it, this very property of the psychic world is that tree of the knowledge of good and evil, "whose mortal taste brought death into the world, and all our woe."

We begin, therefore, with the power of the psychic world, whereby the mind-image is regarded as an object, a second kind of reality, overlaid upon, and added to, the reality of the natural world; and that other power, to which we have just given consideration, whereby the said mind-image is not static but dynamic; does not lie still and quiescent in the field of the observing consciousness, but, on the contrary, is very much alive, and exercises a strong and defined pulling power upon the attention, and through the attention, on the will. This alluring power of the psychic object, the mind-image, has borne much and bitter fruit.

In the first parts of this study we tried to show that pure animal life is dominated by two main tendencies of the Will. The first of these is the search for food, set in motion by the instinct of self-preservation. The animal, and this is practically true of the whole of natural animal life uninfluenced by man, seeks the kind and quantity of food that is needed for its sustenance in bodily vigor and health. Indeed the pressure of the struggle for existence, with its stern morality, would visit with condign punishment any animal which ate itself out of health, or persisted in over-eating itself. And this law has but one punishment, the punishment of death. Its laws are faithfully obeyed. All natural animals, therefore, eat to live; eat just such food as best enables them to live, and in just such quantities; and, as far as we can see, the monotony of the food, its lack of savor and stimulating or palate-tickling properties, plays no part at all, nor is in any way a deterrent. Cows or deer eat the same grass, day in and day out, with quiet relish. Soft-billed birds are content with grubs and worms, for ever and ever.

Again, the body, made up as it is in great part of liquid elements, requires that these liquid elements shall be constantly replaced. Therefore the higher animals drink water regularly, and many of them have their drinking places, where they congregate and commune with one another, in their wordless ways. Pure water, supplemented by the natural moisture of such leaves or fruit or moist animal tissues as make up their food; and, as before, a ceaseless repetition of the same pure liquid, without a shadow of monotony.

Compare this with the ways of man, the fallen animal. Man cannot only eat; he can form the mind-image of food. And thereafter he can rest his consciousness on this mind-image, as on a new kind of object; visible, sensible, yet not outwardly objective. The mind-image is dynamic; this means that the image of the food tasted draws and allures him. In the mind, on the psychic plane, he tastes again the savor he has tasted; rolls once more the choice morsel on the tongue of his psychic man, and enjoys it a second or a third time, nay, many times.

Now as compared with the first or material tasting, this psychic testing has certain well-defined characteristics. In the first place, it bears no relation at all to food, to the nourishing of the body, to the natural function whereby the tissue is replenished. In the pure animal, taste is a simple faculty, whereby it distinguishes the wholesome from the harmful, choosing the nutritious, and setting aside the poisonous. It is a discerning and protecting power. But in man, the psychic creature, with his new psychic powers, taste has become a wholly new thing, a source of enjoyment for enjoyment's sake; a means, therefore of sensuality in the true sense.

The next characteristic of psychic, as contrasted with physical taste, is that it is free from the bonds of time. A piece of food can be eaten once, and once only. You cannot eat your cake and have it; and this every animal knows. But this is not in the least true of psychic taste. Here, you can eat your cake and have it; have it all the more, for each eating. For every time one goes over the psychic image, whether with enjoyment or with repulsion, that very quality in it seems to be strengthened, as though actual new matter, though of course psychic matter, were added to it. Therefore the mind-image of the cake or the candy, as the case may be, is there, within reach, as we saw. It is, in one sense, outside of time, independent of time, not of an hour but of all the day, not of one day only, but of the whole year; in very truth a hardy perennial.

Yet a third property. While it is true that the psychic cake, the psychic candy, the psychic cigarette, is there all the time, and all the time within reach and sight, it is also true that, unlike the food of the pure animal, it does lie under the ban of monotony. The taste palls. The psychic palate becomes jaded. And though it be true, as we saw, that the psychic object grows stronger and stronger by use, yet it is also true that the psychic man gets from it an ever diminishing return of sensation. Therefore he must continuously increase the dose. And this is exactly what takes place. To take a conspicuous example, alcohol is taken almost wholly for its psychical result: for the mood of mind which it produces. It is generally agreed that, save in rare cases, it is actively harmful to the body; and careful experiment has shown that its use means a lowering of all the perceptive and active faculties; a lowering which, curiously enough, is accompanied by a wholly illusive sense of heightened faculty. In other words, alcohol is taken, not at all because it builds up tissue, for it does not; but because it brings about certain psychic states, certain moods of the mind and emotion. And the distinguishing fact about these moods is, that in them the sense of responsibility is dulled, whether it be responsibility for the welfare and safety of others, or responsibility to the laws of purity, honesty, manliness. "Dutch courage," as it is called, is really not courage but recklessness, due to the loss of the feeling of responsibility. And the light-minded pleasure of the user of alcohol is due to the fact that he loses the sense of the burden of duty, the debt owed to Divinity and the Higher Self. Lastly, there is the characteristic of which we have already spoken: that, in order to reach the same degree of sensation, the alcohol must be taken in steadily increasing doses. This is in complete contrast to the natural taking of food, where, as we saw, there may be absolute uniformity, without the least monotony. It is all the difference between the natural and the

psychic taste. The former is simply the guide to right nourishment, for self-sustenance. The latter is mere sensation-seeking; it builds no tissue; and its doses must be steadily increased, till they reach the breaking point of the physical organism.

So far, food and drink, as modified by the psychic nature in man. We must now take up and try to analyse the effect of the same psychic nature on the other great primal power: the instinct of race-preservation, as distinguished from individual preservation.

We tried to give a very general view of this faculty, this marvelous power of race-continuance, as it runs through the whole animal world. We saw that in the vast early periods of animal life, there came a time when the association of the two sexes, for the protection of the young, or for the formation of homes for the rearing of young, prevailed; there being, as yet, no direct sex union. Association for mutual help was the earlier institution.

Later, we saw the development of sex union. And in the higher animals, those which approach closest to the type and form of man, we saw that a high natural morality prevails in sex union; that the general rule is monogamous marriage, a permanent mating, a mating for life. We further tried to bring to light the striking fact that, but for the brief mating period, at most a few weeks, generally only a few days, in each year, the animals are practically sexless, so far as sex union is concerned. In some cases, the sexes are completely separated as soon as the mating time is over; in others, the sexes are associated together, for the better protection of the young, but associated as practically sexless creatures. And, lastly, the unions of natural animals are fertile; their sole purpose is race-continuance; the deliberate creation of infertile unions is a purely human prerogative, a purely human sin.

These contrasts we suggested in an earlier part of this inquiry. We have now reached the stage at which we can ask the cause of this startling and deplorable condition, which distinguishes human from sane and wholesome animal life, with some hope of finding the true answer.

If our understanding be correct, the determining and differentiating cause is the psychic nature: the mirroring power, whereby man is able not only to perceive the external fact, but to build up a second fact, a second object of consciousness, the psychic counterpart of the first object, and then to regard this mind-image as a new, independent object, full in the field of consciousness, at all times within reach, not subject to the limitations of space or time. And, as we saw, the mind-image is not static and quiescent; it is, on the contrary, dynamic, active, drawing and pulling at the attention, in direct proportion to the element of sensation, of enjoyment, which went into

the making of it. And the tasting of the mind-image builds no tissue. It is tasted solely for the sake of sensation, enjoyment for enjoyment's sake.

We can readily apply this to the solution of the problem of sex and the corruption of sex. With the animal, sensation is but the guide to function, as with the power of taste or smell. With degenerate man, sensation is not the guide, but the purpose. And this sensation, mirrored in the field of the mind, is continuously present, so that degenerate man remains, as a Hindu once said, in "a continuous state of tepid amorousness." This, in complete contrast to the brief mating time, followed by the practically sexless year, in the clean and natural animal.

This is the principle to which we are led by our inquiry. The application is not difficult. And that application, if made not in theory only, but in practice, would restore mankind to the clean virtue of animal life, from which he has so grievously degenerated; removing him from the bad eminence of being the one wilfully corrupt animal, the one animal which deliberately seeks to poison the springs of life.

We can well see how the force of desire may thus be introduced into the psychic body of man, and once introduced, how it can be built up and strengthened, until it becomes a dominating and tyrannous power, which its very creator is no longer able to check. It is the old tale of selling the soul to the fiend, who, at first a servile attendant, soon becomes a destructive despot. But we have made it abundantly clear that the passional nature of man is in no sense what he generally calls it, in weak extenuation: a "natural" appetite. Not only is it not natural; it is wholly non-natural and morbid; and only the ceaseless interposition of divine powers holds it back, and prevents it from becoming instantly disastrous.

If we are right in our conclusions, we are justified in saying that to the psychic nature, and to the abuse of its powers, are due the great evils of drunkenness, gluttony and sensuality; and it is admitted by all who can see clearly that to these evils nearly all human sickness, and therefore a vast part of human misery, is directly due. Take the endless griefs and sorrows that come from sex-corruption; the ceaseless tribute of victims; the irremediable waste of lives; the boundless harm done to young lives corruptly, and therefore morbidly brought into being; and add the directly destructive influence of alcohol, especially on the power of clean and healthy generation; add the endless ills which flow from poisoned blood, whether caused by gluttony, alcoholism or sensuality; and we have a grave and formidable total, to be set down to the action of psychic aberration, the abuse of psychic forces by mankind.

Yet we have not touched on the gravest evil. That evil is egotism, selfishness, envy, hatred, malice. If we are right, its genesis is as follows: The natural animal, in order that Nature's purposes may be fulfilled, has the instinct or impulse of self-preservation. In virtue of this instinct, it seeks to preserve its own life, first by seeking food to replace used tissue, and secondly by seeking to escape from dangers, enemies, or hostile natural conditions.

We believe that this simple instinct is mirrored in the psychic nature; and that it there takes on the psychic character, of continuous presence, of dynamic and irritating force. As a result, it becomes inflamed and degenerate, just as we saw in the case of the power of sex. From self-preservation, it grows to self-assertion. From being the impulse to save oneself, it becomes the impulse to dominate others, to compel obedience in them, to make them pay tribute to one's desires, one's enjoyment, one's vanity, one's sensuality. It is thus the seed of ambition, the germ of tyranny, the motive-power in the thirst for gold, the sole purpose of which is to make one's egotism stand out, above the egotism of others; to render one conspicuous and, if possible, envied. For to be envied, is one of the supreme pleasures of base and degenerate man.

We all know the part the looking-glass plays in human vanity. All of us, in our degrees of beauty or plainness, get much pleasure from contemplating our reflections in the mirror. A satirist once went so far as to say: "The Lord created looking-glasses, and rested the seventh day"; meaning that a continuous occupation for mankind had thereby been found. The taste is universal. I was once passing down a fashionable street in a metropolitan city. As will befall, I was seized with doubt as to the straightness of my necktie, and stopped a moment before a plateglass window, to reassure myself. It happened that at the side of this window, there was a broad mirror. In that mirror, I saw reflected, beside by own image, the image of a tramp, ragged, unshaved, dirty, but cheerful. He had found somewhere a piece of bright red ribbon, and had knotted it through the faded paper collar he wore. And he, too, was adjusting his dirty necktie, with exactly the same initial misgiving, the same final half-smile of satisfaction. I caught the pleased gleam in his eye, and saw that he regarded himself complacently, thinking that, after all, he was a pretty good-looking chap. This was a quarter century ago; but I shall never forget the gleam in that tramp's eye, the kindly gleam of self-satisfied vanity.

How soothing, then, how potent the part played in life by the psychic mirror, in which we can paint ourselves as we would be, and then look with approval on the likeness. No court portrait painter ever flattered so much, with such entire success. When it comes to

our mind-portraits of ourselves, we all emulate emperors; we all wear ermine and velvet, deck our brows with crowns, and hold the sceptre and the sphere. Much of life's fretfulness comes of the unwillingness of others to recognize our insignia, and to do meet homage.

Thus far the influence of the psychic world, of the psychic body in man, at least so far as broad outlines are concerned. Further applications can be easily made. When we come to sum up, we find that, to the psychic world, to the psychic body, we owe a twofold debt: a heritage of things good and evil. Memory, with all its joys, its pensive sorrows; foresight, anticipation, what the poet has called the pleasure of hope, are a first-fruit. Of finer and subtler essence is the mental life, the power to view the mind images, and marshal them; the power to abstract certain common qualities, to gather them into new images, and thus to form general notions, broad concepts of things, and of life itself. These, among things good. Then the things evil: sensuality, the seeking of sensation for sensation's sake; ambition, tyranny, including the worst of all tyrannies, which makes others the slaves of our sensualism. Truly a twofold heritage.

May we not hazard a bold conjecture, and say that the psychic nature is indeed that "Tree of the knowledge of good and evil," which the old books of the Hebrews, following the far older Chaldean lore, set in the garden of still unfallen man? Is it not the fruit of this very tree which, tasted in disobedience, has in fact brought about the fall, that fall which, as we saw, has brought to mankind a long roll of sins against nature, in which the natural animals have no share, though they are made to share the penalties? Is it not the psychic nature which, point by point, is the cause of the evils we have been analysing and are we not therefore justified in saying that the Fall, so far from being an idle myth of the prime, is the grave outstanding fact of human life, the source of unnumbered evils which we suffer; all of our own creation; all from the fruit of that original sin?

May we not hazard a further bold guess, and say that the Chaldeans well knew the truth which they enshrined in the old symbol of the Fall, and that they were profoundly scientific when they taught that, by the side of the natural man, a secondary being, the psychic nature, was formed; that this psychic nature had not only the power of the Will, the creative power; but had further the power to abuse this gift: and that through this very abuse of the creative power, as the tempting serpent, mankind did in reality fall, and is at this moment prone, in deepest need of regeneration and redemption?

CHARLES JOHNSTON.

THE MESSENGER FROM THE KING.

A MAN who was hunting for knowledge and wisdom heard another say that the main point of all wisdom was love, and he commenced to think over: "What is love?"

"The whole nature is an expression of love," the same man said.

He who was hunting for wisdom began to brood upon what he had heard and he decided to go and live as a hermit in the wilderness.

"There I will find what I am hunting for," he thought.

He found a peaceful place in a great forest and there he made his home and started his new life with nature and his study.

One day he met a traveling knight who had lost his way in the forest. The knight was called to the king's castle for a banquet, and now he could not find the path. His dress was torn to rags and he was tired and sick.

The hermit was a good-hearted fellow and he helped the tired knight the best he could; took him back to his own cabin, gave him to eat and drink and let him sleep and rest in his bed. He made his own best dress ready for the knight to take when he was strong enough to continue his way to the castle.

After the day was over and the knight had departed, our good-hearted hermit sat resting outside his cabin. He was tired, but he looked over his day and was satisfied with his work.

While he was thus sitting looking into his own heart he felt that some one was gazing at him.

Raising his head he saw a white robed man standing and looking at him with deep, earnest eyes. He knew from his dress that it was a messenger from the king.

The messenger asked him about the knight and the hermit told the story of how he had found him.

The eyes of the messenger grew darker and deeper when he heard of the actions of the hermit.

"Why did you not bring him to the castle?" he asked. "Now he will be too late for the banquet."

"I am sorry," answered the hermit, "but his dress was torn and soiled and he was sick and hungry and too weak to continue his path."

"Do you not think that the king had a better dress and a better bed for him than you can give?" the messenger asked.

"Yes; but he was too tired to go the way."

The messenger smiled. "The way to the Emperor is the life itself, brother; nobody can be weak there. Sick and tired is only he who has lost the path."

"But he was too weak to go back to the way."

"You have to give him power to find the way; give him Courage, Faith and Trust—that will bring him back to the path; teach him Patience, Resignation, Obedience and Compassion, that will for the future keep him on the path."

"And what wonderful thing is that way which leads us to the king's castle, and is able to cure sickness and give us back our lost power?"

"The way to our Ruler," answered the messenger, "is the duty our daily life gives us to fill; keep the mind on your goal and fulfil your daily duty, not alone in the wilderness but among your own people, and you will also one day receive an invitation to the Emperor's banquet."

"What is the Emperor's banquet?"

"The Emperor's banquet is the same as the goal of every man's life; it is peace. Peace comes from strength, strength comes from work, from obedience to our duty, and work comes from ambition. The daily duty is the cradle-song of our eternal life, and first when we reach the eternal world and receive its peace, will the fruit on our life-tree begin to grow. This fruit is the tax we have to give to the Emperor to become a member of his kingdom and receive his invitation; it is the highest act of love we ever can pay to the life."

"Every one must tread his own path and carry his own gifts to the Emperor; do not try to make them go your way."

"To be good is great, brother, but to be wise is more; it takes in both love and respect, and that is the secret of the power of brotherly love."

BERGER ELWING.

"The Master does not appoint a work to his workmen, without giving them the wherewithal to perform it. I have given you no task that you were unable to perform, and always I have seen to it that you had the best means for its accomplishment."

BOOK OF ITEMS.

SWEDENBORG OR THE MYSTIC?

THE question of Swedenborg's place among the mystics—a question of peculiar interest to students of Theosophy—is raised again by the recent publication of his theological works.

These thirty-two thick volumes represent scarcely more than half of Swedenborg's prodigious literary output, and it is to be regretted that the editors of a series at once so extensive and so incomplete should let it lack the advantage of some sketch of the author's life and account of the omitted works. For Swedenborg's writings, far more than most men's, need the key of his life and character for their unlocking.

Emanuel Swedberg, later Baron Swedenborg, was born in Stockholm on the 29th of January, 1688. The son of a Lutheran bishop, his letters tell us that he was from a child deeply interested in religion, "taking delight in conversing with clergymen about faith, saying that the life of faith is love and that the love which imparts life is love to the neighbor; also that God gives faith to every one, but that those only receive it who practise that love." He graduated with some distinction from the University of Upsala in 1709, and shortly afterwards went to England, and later to Holland and France, to pursue his studies in mathematics, physics, and astronomy.

Though he early proved his ability as a scientist and mathematician, publishing the first Algebra in the Swedish tongue and elaborating a new method for the determination of terrestrial longitude, the eminently practical and concrete bent of his mind made him impatient of all scientific speculation that could not be immediately applied. "It is a fatality," he writes, "with mathematicians that they are content to remain mostly in theory. I have thought it would be a profitable thing if to ten mathematicians there were added one thoroughly practical man, by whom the others could be led to market; in which case this one man would gain more renown and be of more use than all the ten together." This feeling led him to devote himself to engineering and mechanics rather than to pure mathematics, and in view of his later work it is interesting to find him urging that, if funds were lacking for the establishment of a chair in mechanics at his native university, a professorship in theology might well be spared. He started a scientific journal, *Dædalus Hyperboreus*, which won him the patronage of the King; and at twenty-eight he was appointed assessor of the State Board of Mines. This post he

* *Swedenborg's Works*. Rotch Edition. Thirty-two volumes. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

occupied for twenty-six years, being detached from time to time for special services, such as the construction of the great dock at Carlscrona, his engineering enterprises at the siege of Frederickshall, or for prolonged foreign tours of study and inspection. These last took him all over Europe and brought him into contact with most of the learned men of the day.

The letters he wrote on these journeys are of the greatest value as showing those characteristics of his mind which colored all his work. No detail of commerce or manufactory escapes him; his observations here are shrewd and to the point. But to art and beauty he is blind. He tells us of the hidden wealth of the mountains, but never of their grandeur. The stones and dimension of a cathedral will elicit his praise, but of its feeling and spirit he knows nothing. He never rises above the machinery of life. His mind, absorbed in analysis, lets him see nothing whole.

Yet for this whole he is always searching. Following a number of miscellaneous scientific works and three heavy volumes of *Opera Philosophica et Mineralia*, he publishes a short treatise on the Infinite—the one great whole. Admirably clear and logical it is,—so logical that nothing is gained. There remains the Infinite and the finite; but the nexus he postulates is at the end as unknown as at the beginning. Face to face with the failure of the discursive intellect to lay hold on unity, he sets himself to a task whose boldness and magnitude are equalled only by the unflagging energy with which he pursued it. It is nothing less than to explore nature from the whole field of its effects, to gather together the wonderful accumulations of scientific knowledge and unify and interpret them.

"I intend," he wrote, "to examine physically and philosophically, the whole anatomy of the body.... The end I propose to myself in this work is a knowledge of the soul, since this knowledge will constitute the crown of my studies. I have chosen to approach by the analytic way; and I think I am the first who has taken this course professedly. To accomplish this grand end I enter the circus, designing to consider and examine thoroughly the whole world, or microcosm, which the soul inhabits, for I think it is in vain to seek her anywhere but in her own kingdom. I am resolved to allow myself no respite until I have run through the whole field to the very goal, until I have traversed the universal animal kingdom to the soul. Thus I hope that, by bending my course inward continually, I shall open all the doors that lead to her, and at length contemplate the soul herself by the divine permission!"

Some twenty years before he had published a dissertation to prove that the transmission of sensation in the body was due to vibration in the nerve fluids, even advancing the hypothesis of sympathetic

vibrations as an explanation of what we now call telepathy. To these anatomical studies he returned, and for some years pursued them untiringly, seeking the greatest anatomists as his teachers. The result was the publication in 1740 and 1741 of his "Economy of the Animal Kingdom," and in the three following years appeared the first three volumes of what was meant to be a much greater work—abandoned, however, because he became conscious of its futility. After ten years of labor scalpel and balance fail him as did his unaided logic. "Nothing," he confesses, "is farther removed from the human understanding than what at the same time is really present to it; and nothing is more present to it than what is universal, prior, and superior; since this enters into every particular and into everything posterior and inferior. What is more omnipresent than Deity—in Him we live and move and have our being—and yet what is more remote from the sphere of the understanding?" So is the soul in man. It is no secretion in our arteries or brains, no organ of the body. It is the Self, transfusing all, using all, giving life to all.

Yet his failure to find the soul where he had sought it was by no means barren. From it emerges his doctrine of Representation and Correspondence, which, old as the history of thought itself, came to him as a fresh revelation. Here he finds the long sought nexus between the Infinite and the finite, here sees spirit mirrored in matter.

"In our doctrine of representations and correspondences," he says, "we shall treat of the astonishing things which occur, I will not say in the living body only, but throughout all nature, and which correspond so entirely with spiritual things that one would swear that the physical world is purely symbolical of the spiritual world—insomuch that if we chose to express any natural truth in physical and definite vocal terms, and to convert them into the corresponding spiritual terms, we shall by this means elicit a spiritual truth in place of the physical truth."

It is of no small interest to students of Theosophy to see how clearly Swedenborg here states a fundamental principle of Eastern philosophy—that all the richness of manifested life is but the many-hued reflection of the spirit. The further truth that spirit is one, forms mistily above his mind but never grows wholly clear—and this lack distorts and narrows all his teaching. Nevertheless the doctrine of correspondences opens many doors to him, and from this time on he took it for his guide, bending all his energies to the perception of the spiritual significance within familiar things.

In 1745, he published what is usually regarded as the work which marks the transition from his scientific to his theological writings, "The Worship and Love of God." It is full of strange imagery, strange allegory of the birth of the universe, emanating from God;

of the birth of the planets from the sun; of the animal kingdom from the vegetable; and the vegetable from the mineral; each higher form lying concealed within the lower, and gradually evolving and manifesting itself in unbroken series. Yet through the strangeness of imagery profound theosophic truths are revealed. The nebular hypothesis of science, the first mist-born worlds of the *Secret Doctrine*, the upward evolution of the animal organism and the descent of the soul into material Life—all are indicated, as is the connection of the soul with all spiritual forces, so that it becomes a channel for all above it. This leads to the doctrine of Degrees or Hierarchies, that “supreme things or things superior in order, flow into inferior things, and these into ultimate things, but not *vice versa*; hence inferior things derive their powers and perfections from superior things and thence flow all their qualities and abilities. When this order is established, then there is nothing so complicated and abstruse which is not explained and unfolded, for *it is the light itself which sees, and the living force which acts*.... But it is altogether otherwise if this order be inverted, that is if liberty be given to nature to break in, without leave, into the higher and sacred recesses of life.”

“The Worship and Love of God” was written at a time of great stress, in which, we learn from Swedenborg’s private diary, his whole nature was undergoing an inner revolution. He dreams strange and terrible dreams. His conscience sears him for impurity of mind and heart. Pride of intellect seems to stand as a wall between him and God, but in his dreams he hears a promise that if he will but put his preconceptions away, and “become as a little child,” then he will be able to be nurtured in spiritual knowledge. He falls into trances and has visions of both heaven and hell. Gradually, from their initial chaos, these visions become more ordered and more stable. He deems that he is taught of the Lord that spiritual truth is not to be known by the intellect, but by spiritual vision; and that he is bidden to record his conversations with angels and devils, and to interpret the inner sense of the scriptures—a sense which is to apply not only to the creation of the physical world, but to the creation of the spiritual man. At the age of fifty-seven, he begins this task and labors ceaselessly in its fulfilment for the thirty years left him of life. The thirty-two thick volumes of his theological writings constitute a monument to his fidelity.

Such was the man’s life. The immensity of his mind is revealed in his works. His writings are encyclopædic. Methodical, logical, taking nothing for granted, despising nothing as small or unimportant, he gives to every detail of his themes the most painstaking treatment. Under the title of “The Heavenly Arcana Disclosed,”

sentence by sentence he considers the books of Genesis and Exodus, using his doctrine of correspondences to support the spiritual meaning he finds in them, or which his visions have revealed. In like manner he deals with the Apocalypse, and in "Heaven and Hell" and "Divine Love and Wisdom" he continues the record of "the wonderful things heard and seen in the world of spirits." Always analytic, dispassionate, unmoved to wonder or ecstasy, he passes with a cold, calm majesty through as wierd a phantasmagoria as ever entered the psychic's brain, or found form in Kama Loka.

In truth Swedenborg is the great prophet and expounder of Kama Loka. Writing at a time when religion was very evanescent in men's minds, when works were subordinated to faith, and faith was little more than a formal verbal assent to uncomprehended dogmas, Swedenborg gives to his pictures of life after death a startling realism and concrete vividness. The torments of hell and the delights of heaven are wholly definite and objective, and it is the man himself, as he now is, who enjoys or suffers them. Each virtue or each vice leads its possessor to a region whose heavenly geography is precisely charted, and the manners and customs of whose inhabitants are described with conscientious detail. But when he tells us that before we can go to heaven, heaven must have come to us, and that no one will go to hell who has not first received hell into his soul, he is uttering a profound truth. "It can in no case be said that heaven is without or around anyone, but that it is within him; and this plainly shows how much they are deceived who believe that to go to heaven is to be elevated amongst angels, without any regard to the quality of the interior life, and thus that heaven may be conferred on anyone by an act of unconditional mercy; when the truth is that if heaven is not within us, nothing of the heaven which is around can flow in and be received." And again: "The states of the interiors make heaven." This is his central doctrine, and one wholly theosophic, that the life after death is a gradual sloughing off of surface and foreign things until the man's inner nature, what he is and desires in the core of himself, is left free, and draws him to his kind.

In these days of attempted salvation by "hypnotism" and "suggestion," it is interesting to see this stress which Swedenborg lays on the man's inner desire—against the effect of which neither faith nor works, nor repression can prevail so long as it remains unchanged. There is need for complete and absolute freedom in all things of the spirit, and no spiritual acquisition can be permanent that is not appropriated in freedom. So far does Swedenborg carry this principle that he denies the possibility of salvation through hope of reward or punishment, or by conversion in sickness or when

the mind or will is under coercion of any kind. It is the love of the heart alone that moves in the spiritual world; and the religious message he preaches is that of the Christ: "Turn your hearts for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

Perhaps no one of Swedenborg's works reveals more clearly at once the value of his inspiration and the distortion and materialization it suffered in expression, than his "Marriage Love." Here the "pairs of opposites," and the unity behind duality, are dealt with, and the union of the True and the Good, of Power and Wisdom, is made to correspond with the union of man and woman—when "love of sex" has been transformed into "love for one of the sex," and has passed beyond the body to the spirit. His theme and his message are alike high and spiritual, but are so hardened and materialized as to repel rather than attract.

"Swedenborg, or the Mystic," such was the title and place which Emerson gave him. But as we read that essay, and even more as we ponder Swedenborg's own writings, the phrase repeats itself, not as a designation, but as a question: Swedenborg, or the Mystic? And this question rises and confronts us on every page, so dissonant is the message which seeks expression and the mind which seeks to formulate and convey it. His pages breathe the deepest truths, yet they leave us cold. His philosophic teaching is one of love, that love is the life of man and the Being of God, yet we rise from reading with no kindled spark in our hearts. In his pages love becomes a cold and distant thing—his joys are joyless:

I see them all, so excellently fair,

I see, not feel, how beautiful they are.

His mind, his great gift, proved also a barrier he was never able to transcend. Though his spirit strains the net of his logic and his incurable psychic anthropomorphism, he never breaks through to freedom. The mystic union with the core of life is seen but never felt. "How different," exclaims Emerson, "is Jacob Behmen. *He* is tremulous with emotions, and listens awe-struck, with the gentlest humanity, to the Teacher whose lessons he conveys; and when he asserts that, 'in some sort, love is greater than God,' his heart beats so high that the thumping against his leathern coat is heard across the centuries. 'Tis a great difference."

It is indeed a great difference, and as we look back through the succession of the Illuminati, through the long roll of Christian mystics, Molinos and Fénelon, St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross, St. Catherine of Siena and St. Francis of Assisi, Tauler and Nicholas of Basle, and behind these to the mysticism of the East, which Swedenborg repeats in so strange a guise, the very identity of doctrine makes the difference more marked.

In the Mandukya Upanishad,—which Mr. Johnston's translation has made accessible to readers of the THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY,—we find the fourfold division of the worlds and of consciousness which Swedenborg portrayed, and by which alone he can be judged. Beyond the physical world of waking consciousness is the psychical world, where, as on a window-pane lit from within and from without, are reflected and blended images of things natural and spiritual. Here are shadows of the outer world, of old thoughts and old desires. Here, too, the truths of the spirit and the movement of the creative will take form and imagery. This is the world we enter in dream consciousness, as it is also the world of the clairvoyant and clairaudient. Beyond it is the spiritual world, the world of dreamless consciousness which we enter "when we enter into rest, desiring no desire, beholding no dream," when the mind is still and the consciousness passes to the heart. Here is the "womb of all"; beyond it is but the Infinity of God. This is the inner world of the mystic where in silence and stillness his heart is open to the Infinity above him and lays hold of spiritual knowledge at its root. To this third world where the faculties are centred in the heart, Swedenborg was lifted; but in it he could not remain, for, as his whole life showed, with his heart he could not perceive. Instead he records for us the imagery, true and false, of the mid-world of psychic shadows.

No, Swedenborg was no mystic, but in his psychism, so formalized and ordered by his mighty logic that its fantastic distortion is doubly dangerous, mysticism seeks voice and utterance. The mind of the scientist was torn open to dream and vision, but beyond the barrier of form he could not go. Yet if his heart lay dumb and silent, his will never faltered, and through the long years of his labor he earned the one title he ever gave himself:

*"Emanuel Swedenborg,
Servant of the Lord Jesus Christ."*

May our service be as faithful as was his.

HENRY BEDINGER MITCHELL.

ON THE SCREEN OF TIME.

A GENERAL SURVEY.

THE Screen this quarter must either reflect a multitude of interesting though not really great events, or one of these events, which strikes us as the most significant, must be singled out for comment. Much has happened since the October issue went to press. Dr. Francis Darwin, the brilliant son of the great Darwin, in his Presidential address before the British Association, has deliberately revived, in a rational form, the "point of view of the child or of the writer of fairy stories" with respect to plants. "We know that flowers do not talk," he says (though how he "knows" it he does not say), "but the fact that plants must be classed with animals as regards their manner of reaction to stimuli has now become almost a commonplace of physiology." And he goes further than this. He finds in the movements of plants the dim beginnings of habit or "unconscious memory," and he gives an account of observations and experiments which prove his point. At this rate, science will soon be hunting for a form of matter which does *not* possess "memory."

Then, Professor Onnes, of Leyden, has succeeded in liquefying helium, as was predicted by Dr. Dewar in his Presidential address to the British Association in 1902. This involved the production of a temperature of 457 degrees below the Fahrenheit zero, a temperature at which air or hydrogen would be hard as granite. This should help to free our minds from any rigid conception of the solid, liquid and gaseous states; and should also help us to understand why "matter," at one period of evolution, may be very much more dense than at another. Students of Theosophy will remember that, according to the occult tradition, even the bodies of the inhabitants of Atlantis were like iron in comparison with our own.

Next, we have the experiments of Dr. Alexis Carrel of the Rockefeller Institute in New York, who, at a meeting of the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia, declared that he had replaced the abdominal arteries of a cat with the carotid arteries of a dog; and that once, when he received a human leg from a New York hospital, he kept the arteries twenty-four days in a refrigerator and then put them into a dog. The inference is, as the newspapers at once pointed out, that hereafter, in cases of fatal accident, the uninjured members and organs of victims may find resurrection by implantation into the frames of living patients. For these experiments it is impossible for us, as Theosophists, to say a good word. The

prospect of being kept alive by having grafted into us the cold-storage stomach of a dead man does not fill us with joy, but with unutterable disgust. If people were less afraid of death, they would be less willing to pay for life by outraging, not only the moral law, but the most elementary decencies of nature.

But the very latest sensation has been that provided by Mr. Fournier d'Albé, the Secretary of the Dublin Society for Psychical Research, who has announced his belief that the soul of man is an aggregation of "psychomeres," or soul particles, inhabiting the individual cells of the human body. "These psychomeres," he says, "are probably opaque to ultra-violet light, and, therefore, may some day be made visible by more powerful optical means than we at present possess. They will then be weighed and measured also." Unfortunately, Mr. d'Albé does not support his theory with facts; but his theory is interesting in itself as showing that a belief in some sort of inner body is becoming more and more widespread. It is clear, however, that the task of Theosophists is unending. Years ago, we combated the idea that the physical body is the person. That idea scarcely needs any longer to be refuted. Materialism, in its cruder forms, is almost extinct. But now it revives one plane higher up, and we shall soon have to deal with the belief that the astral or ethereal double is the soul and immortal ego.

BRAIN AND PERSONALITY.

The event of the quarter which strikes us as the most significant is the appearance of yet another edition, the eighth, of Dr. William Hanna Thomson's *Brain and Personality, or The Physical Relations of the Brain to the Mind*; because this proves how hungry people are for confirmation of their belief in the reality of the soul. That a great neurologist and brain specialist, instead of laughing at them for their "superstition," has undertaken to prove scientifically that their belief is well-founded, has filled thousands with delight, and has also justified the opinion of a well-known publisher who declared that what people now want is religion and again religion, in almost any form.

Dr. Thomson's is a book of magnificent conclusions: that the brain is merely the instrument of the mind, "while the personality itself is as different and as separate from it (the brain) as the violinist is separate from, and not the product of his violin." Further, "that the mind is not only the subordinate, but well-nigh invariably the merest servant in man of the will, and by it even as despotically ruled as the mind in turn often despotically rules the body."

And yet the book can best be described as a splendid attempt to achieve the impossible. For it is an attempt to prove by physical

means the reality of a metaphysical fact. In the very nature of things any such effort is foredoomed to failure. It is more hopeless than the measurement of time with a yard-stick, or the investigation of stars and planets with a scalpel.

We expect that even the author would admit that his conclusions preceded his argument: that he *knew* certain things, and then undertook to demonstrate, anatomically and physiologically, the truth of what he knew.

Every discoverer, unless he stumbles accidentally upon a fact, anticipates, by at least one stage, the result of experiments which he has not yet conducted. He works consciously towards a goal which his physical eyes cannot see, but which he hopes and believes is there. He "jumps to a conclusion;" he "foresees" a result. And yet, as a rule, he does not realize that this faculty of direct perception is just as real and even more serviceable than the mental effort which enables him to carry his experiments through the intermediate stages to the conclusion which he anticipates. Nor does he realize that this is a faculty which can be used consciously and deliberately, with as thorough an understanding of its processes as that which he believes he now has of the operations of the mind. Tell him, if he would become conscious in that higher sense; if he would exercise his faculty of "knowing" voluntarily instead of involuntarily and spasmodically—tell him that he must first still, and still utterly, the thousand voices of his mind, and he will regard you as mentally deranged. Still *his* mind! To him it would mean extinction. Yet in every age and in every nation, this science of direct perception has been studied and has been mastered. Thousands of volumes have been written about it.

PERSONALITY AND KNOWLEDGE.

One such book we have before us—an old text-book, recently acquired. Its title and description alone will be enough to drive our scientific readers, or most of them, to flight. They will read no more. And yet we do not refer to Patanjali's *Yoga Aphorisms*. The book we speak of was named originally, *Sancta Sophia*, and is now published under the title: "*Holy Wisdom, or Directions for the Prayer of Contemplation*, by the Ven. Father F. Augustin Baker, a monk of the English Congregation of the Holy Order of Saint Benedict, methodically digested by R. F. Serenus Cressy of the same Order and Congregation, and now edited from the Douay edition of 1657 by the Right Rev. Abbot Sweeney, D.D." The fact that this book was recommended in the year 1657 by Br. Angelus Francis, "Lector Jubilante, and Episcopal Censurer of Books," as well as by "Your unworthy sister and servant, S. Catharine de S. Maria, Abbess

Unworthy; Cambray, July 7, 1657"—will not, we fear, counteract such prejudice against it. Nevertheless, in spite of its endless repetition and verbiage, we venture to express the opinion that there is more actual wisdom and more utility in this old book than in many expositions of modern science.

Father Baker's language is necessarily theological. We may prefer to use other terms to describe the same facts. It would be impossible for most of us, in this age, to speak of God as he does, or to define a system of practical psychology as a process of "hearkening to His voice and call, and learning how to distinguish it clearly from the voice and solicitations of human reason or corrupt nature." We can imagine the disgust of certain exponents of Christianity when told that one of the ways to distinguish between "false lights" and "our lights," is to remember that the false lights render those who follow them "incapable of solitude, and thrust them abroad to be reformers of others, being themselves impatient of all reformation and contradiction." And that: "Our lights make us to fear and avoid all supereminence and judicature, all sensual pleasures, desires of wealth, honors, etc. Whereas their lights engage them violently and deeply in all these carnal and secular ways, and (for the attaining to these) in tumults, sedition, bloodshed, and war; in a word, in all manner of actions and designs most contrary to the spirit of Christianity."

But Father Baker's language should not blind us to the philosophy of his teaching. He insists, as every Theosophist in every age has insisted, that we are capable of receiving divine light, and of distinguishing it from the false lights of "human reason or corrupt nature." In other words, his fundamental proposition is, that there is a faculty in man which can be described as that of direct cognition, higher than the reasoning faculty, and the use of which we can develop and cultivate by persistent effort of the right kind. Step by step he describes the means by which this "interior illumination" can be obtained. In every department of life, he says, in the smallest as well as in the greater problems which confront us, this "knowing" faculty should be exercised. Finally, he declares that it is possible at last, by means of contemplation carried further and further along the stages which he describes, and by "rejecting and striving to forget all images and representations of Him or anything else," to reach the state of "imageless recollection," and then to a condition of actual union with Deity.

Dr. Thomson, in all probability, would regard Father Baker's philosophy, not only with tolerance, but with keen interest and sympathy. But how few neurologists would do so! Would they not consider his subordination of "human reason" to some hidden and inner Light, as evidence in itself of mental derangement? And yet

they could not possibly accuse him of that form of insanity which is catalogued as "emotional." No one could disapprove more methodically than this disciple of Saint Benedict, of emotion in any form. He says: "In such doubtful cases of moment, especially if they concern something to be done, or omitted, or suffered in the future, a devout soul is to avoid all sudden and unadvised resolutions; and this especially when she is in any kind of passion, whether it be fear, anger, grief, *or else* of tenderness, compassion, and kindness, etc. . . .

In case the soul in her nature be inclined more to the one side of the doubt than the other, she must enforce herself, especially in prayer, to an indifference and resignation in the matter; rather fore-thinking (and accordingly preparing herself) that God will declare His will for the contrary to that to which her nature is more inclined. In seeking to know the divine will by prayer, let not the person make the subject and business of his recollection to be the framing a direct prayer about the matter; neither let him in his prayer entertain any discoursing, debating thoughts in his imagination or understanding about it, as if he had an intention to account that to be God's will which by such discourse seemed most probable. 1. Because, by such proceedings, our prayers, which should be pure and internal in spirit, will be turned into a distracting meditation upon an external affair, and so the mind comes to be filled with sensible images, and passions perhaps will be raised. 2. Because by so doing we incur the danger of being seduced, by mistaking our own imagination or perhaps natural inclination for the divine light and motion, whereas such divine light is most effectually and securely, yea, and seldom otherwise, obtained than when the imagination is quiet and the soul in a profound recollection in spirit. 3. Because such discoursing in time of prayer is anything else but prayer, being little more than human consideration and examination of the matter, the which, if at all, ought to be despatched before prayer."

We are not by any means quoting Father Baker as a final authority on the subject. But he was a genuine mystic, and he would not have made the mistake of attempting to prove the existence and reality of the soul by physiological argument or anatomical investigations. True it is that he would not have been tempted to do so; and the temptation to-day, for anyone who has the extraordinary knowledge of such men as Dr. Thomson, must indeed be overwhelming. The attempt undoubtedly merits the highest praise and admiration, and if we venture to point out the impossibility of success, we do so, not in a spirit of criticism, but in the hope that similar ability, with all the advantages of modern culture, will be brought to bear on the solution of the problem to which Father Baker and others devoted their lives.

THE BRAIN AN INSTRUMENT OR GENERATOR?

The question which Dr. Thomson sets out to answer is, which of the two fundamentally opposed conceptions about the relations of the brain with the mind is correct: that thought proceeds from the substance of the brain itself, when played upon by the wind of outer impressions, just as music is generated on the strings of an Æolian harp; or, on the other hand, that the brain is merely an instrument, like a violin, played upon by the personality as something absolutely distinct from the physical means of expression?

The Doctor shows first that the weight of a man's brain has no connection with his mental capacity. He gives figures to prove this. Next he shows that the size of the brain in no way governs the quality of its thinking. Finally, under this head, he proves that it is impossible to trace any connection between the complexity of the convolutions and the activity or power of the different mental faculties. The so-called mathematical convolutions are found to be as largely developed in the brains of paupers, dying in hospitals, as in the brains of the few mathematicians which Gall and other phrenologists examined; while the brains of some eminent men had no specially developed convolutions where they ought to have had them. Even the brains of chimpanzees, so far as structure goes, present us, not only with every lobe, but with every convolution of the human brain; from which it follows that if the similarity of brain formation and mechanism, carried out to the smallest details, be all that is needed, there would be no reason why baboons should not become philosophers or mathematicians.

Having disposed of these preliminary misconceptions—to the disappointment, doubtless, of those who believe in “bumps”—Dr. Thomson reminds us, that strictly speaking we have not got one brain, but two brains. Just as we have two eyes, two ears, etc., so we have a right and a left “hemisphere.” Now the anatomical seats of the senses, and those of muscular movements, are found in both hemispheres of the brain alike. It was thus naturally inferred, as the brain is a double organ, like our two eyes, that both brains should participate equally in all mental work. This theory was totally upset by the discovery by Broca that the anatomical seats of the faculty of speech are found in one of the two hemispheres only. If a man be right-handed, the anatomical seats of his faculty of speech are found in the left hemisphere of his brain, and *vice versa*. Thus, if the Broca convolution, which is the seat of articulate speech, be damaged in a person after middle life, the loss is usually irremediable, so that he can speak no longer even though the same convolution in the other hemisphere remains wholly intact. The same is true of word-deafness or word-blindness from injury of their respective places in the active hemisphere.

Upon this slender foundation Dr. Thomson builds up a superstructure which strikes us as dangerously pretentious. It would be impossible for us to adopt his argument. Nor can we accept his proposition that the brain is "the one organ in us which is related to thought." Professor G. T. Ladd arrives at a very different conclusion. In his *Elements of Physiological Psychology* (Part II, chap. X, sec. 21), he states that "No good ground exists for speaking of any special organ or seat of memory. Every organ—indeed, every area and every element—of the nervous system has its own memory." And in section 4 of the same chapter he declares that "there is no special organ of will."

What is true of memory is equally true of most other mental processes, even the center of personal self-consciousness, as we believe, shifting as the level of thought, and the state of development of the person, vary.

It does not seem that Dr. Thomson draws a sufficient distinction between self-consciousness and will on the one hand, and the power of physical expression on the other. However that may be, it is doubtful if the average materialist will be convinced when Dr. Thomson assures him that because the speech center is located in the left hemisphere when a person is right-handed, we are justified in jumping directly to the conclusion "that brain matter, as such, does not originate speech, for then, both hemispheres would have their speech centers." He insists that there must be choice on the part of the personality as to whether it will use the right or the left hand, and thus, indirectly, as to whether the personality will use the right or left hemisphere of the brain. But he admits that the anatomical seats of muscular movements are congenital, and it is difficult to see why the greater serviceability of either the right or the left hand should not be congenital also.

It would serve no useful purpose, however, to supply our common antagonist, the Materialist, with arguments. Our object is to emphasize the fact that it is dangerous to rely upon physical proofs of metaphysical truths. Dr. Thomson states his case more ably and far more convincingly than we have stated it for him. He says, for instance, that "if the quantity of gray matter is the fact for us to found our superstructure upon, one-half of this matter being in the right brain and the other half in the left brain, it follows that if one of the two brains be rendered useless by any chance, either half the mind, or half of the mental capacity will be gone." And then, in reply to the question "Is that so?" he says that it is not, and that, at least to his own satisfaction, "it has been abundantly demonstrated that one of the two brains can do all the thinking necessary for the purposes of life," and he cites the authority of Sir Michael Foster,

who declares that "we are completely in the dark as to the reason why we possess two hemispheres"—hemispheres which, as regards their gray matter, correspond furrow for furrow, lobe for lobe, and convolution for convolution.

Dr. Thomson states that "it has been repeatedly shown by *post mortem* examinations that persons have lived for years with only one hemisphere in working order, the other having been virtually destroyed by disease; but with the exception of parts in one half of their bodies being paralyzed for voluntary movement, such as those of the arms and legs, they have thought and acted and transacted business as well with one-half of the gray matter with which they started in life, *i. e.*, with only one hemisphere, as others are able to use one eye for all purposes after losing its mate" (pp. 62-63). Instead, however, of inferring from this, as Dr. Thomson does, that one hemisphere of the brain is practically useless, the other half having been chosen by the personality as its instrument—could it not be inferred, at least as legitimately, that the brain is much less essential as a vehicle of consciousness than is ordinarily supposed?

Dr. Thomson says: "With the great majority of persons the speech centers are located exclusively in the left hemisphere. It is a part of the left superior temporal convolution which hears words; it is a part of the left angular gyrus which sees words; and it is the left Broca's convolution which utters words. In all such persons the corresponding places in the right hemisphere are not speech areas at all." But surely it does not follow from this that the corresponding places in the right hemisphere are useless? Would it not be more just to say that modern physiologists are not acquainted with their uses?

MENTALITY AND WILL.

Dr. Thomson's study of the language centers is particularly interesting. He demonstrates clearly that instead of language making the man (as it was a fad of philology at one time to suggest)—"it is man who makes language." "The gray layer of our brains is actually plastic and capable of being fashioned," the plasticity, however, diminishing progressively with age. Dr. Thomson takes the faculty of reading as the best instance of this plasticity, or what he describes as the "educability" of the brain; because the faculty of reading cannot possibly be described as congenital. It is undeniably the work of Will, and, from his point of view, must be most sharply distinguished from the activities of the Medulla Oblongata and of the spinal cord, which, although they wear all the aspects of designed or purposive muscular acts, actually, from first to last, are purely automatic. The functions of the spinal cord are organized by the steady unvary-

ing operation of afferent stimuli; the functions, on the other hand, of the left angular gyrus, and of the other higher brain centers which we have named, are the result of deliberate training by the will of the personality. In other words, "the brain is a physical and material thing" which, of itself, has "no properties of mind, and becomes related to mental processes only in certain localities by becoming there artificially, and not originally or congenitally, endowed with such functions." From which it follows, as Dr. Thomson says, "that *we can make our own brains*, so far as special mental functions or aptitudes are concerned, if only we have wills strong enough to take the trouble: by practice, practice, practice."

"Do not expect much from a New Year Day's resolution. Your will can make a new man of you, but only after its fashion when making anything new in the brain—by reiterating this same resolution stimulus every single day after New Year's for the whole year at least, *just as you learn by it a new language*." For it is one of the properties of the personal human Will to be a specific brain stimulus, "more potent than all the afferent stimuli together in producing changes in brain matter." In other words, it is a man's Will, and not his environment, which is the principal factor in determining the character of his brain.

The education of the will, then is of the first importance. "A mind always broken in to the sway of the will, and therefore thinking according to will, and not according to reflex suggestion, constitutes a purposive life . . . Teach a child self-restraint, and you are directly developing thereby his will power."

INNER BODIES.

Dr. Thomson does not deal with the problem of the connection between the Will and the brain. He does not face the need of postulating the existence of an ethereal or astral medium; of a subtler body interpenetrating the physical brain and body during life, in order to account for the transmission of Will impulse to the physical nerve centers. Yet he intimates, as will be seen in our concluding quotation, that the soul may use a different body after death. Why not during life also? He tells us that the white matter of the brain, which lies underneath and within the gray layer, consists of bundles of gray fibers "contained within sheaths of apparently an *insulating material*." A study of the electrical phenomena of the brain might suggest the existence of still finer forces, within or behind the electrical—and might help even to explain Father Baker's constant references to "the motions" of the soul! This does not mean, of course, that we regard the soul as material. The soul, in essence, must be formless; but in manifestation, if the philosophical require-

ments are to be met, it must be conceived of as being associated with some unthinkably subtle forms of force and substance, even on the highest plane of its manifestation. And these unthinkably subtle forms of force and substance, actuated by the Soul, would affect the grades of force and substance "beneath" or "without" them; until some corresponding organ in the physical body is reached, and expression, on this plane, and perhaps in a more or less perverted way (depending upon the responsiveness of the various instruments), is given to the original impulse.

But we cannot expect scientists to reach immediately and in all respects to the conclusions of the old esoteric philosophy. They are working splendidly, though unconsciously, in that direction, and we are grateful to them for their fearless search for truth. Dr. Thomson, in particular, we are tempted to include at once within the theosophical fold! His hope—we suspect it to be his belief and profound conviction—regarding the hereafter, is amazingly in accord with our own views, though we would not limit it to some after-death state. "We can now conceive," he says, "of a body no longer made of the most temporary forms of that matter which is itself passing away, but fashioned to be a dynamic body, a body of power which need not shrink, as here, from the heavy burden of the will. There should be no night there, for sleep will not be needed, when purpose does not weary nor its exercise fatigue. Then as to the mind: we know that at present the word Enough is only understood, but not experienced, by man, and the opportunities for knowledge in a universe would not be too many for his desires. But above all rises a conception of a perfection of being, when the will so responds to the highest motives alone, that there could be no conflict with lower motives forever!"

T.

"Why hasten so eagerly from one activity to another, when we serve Him as well by keeping still?"

BOOK OF ITEMS.



ELEMENTARY ARTICLES

V.

THEOSOPHY AND THE PROBLEM OF CRIME AND CRIMINALS.

EVERY century has its own problems, and one of the greatest problems of this century is, "How shall men live together as one human Brotherhood?" On this continent the question is acute, for we are a conglomerate, heterogeneous population. Men of every race and of every religion are here; men of every color—red, black, white and yellow; men of every class—the poorest and the richest, the wisest and the most ignorant are here trying to live together. We are not held together by traditions, for these are not alike; nor by a common creed, for these are not the same; nor by common social conditions, for these are as far apart as they are in Europe. Only as we are moved by the instinct of human brotherhood do we live together peaceably. There are a great many who work against these instincts. They are enemies of the social order that we call criminals. Some of them follow crime as a profession, while others seem just to drift into crime without any will or purpose of their own. It has been estimated that if you take the criminals and all the people depending on them that they number about a million in the United States. And this class seems to be increasing in every country except Great Britain, where it is decreasing.

What shall we do with these enemies of human brotherhood? When a man raises his hand against society, tramples law underfoot, breaks into houses, strikes his neighbor and kills him, shows himself unworthy of this brotherhood, what shall we do with him? Shall we revenge ourselves on him, punish him, shut him up in a cell and forget to care for him? When he has killed his brother shall we kill him, or try to cure him of this evil disposition? How has the world treated these foes of brotherhood in the past? Any good history of criminal law would give an account something like this: "The wheel, the caldron of boiling oil, burning alive, burying alive, flaying, tearing apart with wild horses, were the ordinary

expedients by which the criminal jurist sought to deter crime, by frightful examples which would make a profound impression on a not over-sensitive population. An Anglo-Saxon law punishes a female slave by making eighty other female slaves each bring three pieces of wood and burn her to death, while each contributes a fine besides. Frederick II., the most enlightened prince of his time, burned captive rebels to death in his presence, and is even said to have encased them in lead in order to roast them slowly. In France women were customarily burned or buried alive for simple felonies. The criminal code of Charles V., issued in 1530, is a hideous catalogue of blinding, mutilation, tearing with hot pincers, burning alive and breaking on the wheel. In England prisoners were boiled to death as late as 1542, as in the cases of Rouse, and Margaret Davie. In England to cut out a man's tongue, or pluck out his eyes, with malice prepense, was not a felony until the fifteenth century, in a criminal law so severe that, even in the reign of Elizabeth, the robbing of a hawk's nest was similarly a felony; and as recently as 1833 a child of nine was sentenced to be hanged for breaking a patched pane of glass and stealing two-pence worth of paint."

In other words they have hated the criminal and given expression to that hatred by hurting them, and that is the principle on which a high authority says we should act to-day. Here are the words of Sir James Stephens:* "I think it highly desirable that criminals should be hated, that the punishment inflicted upon them should be so contrived as to give expression to that hatred, and to justify it, so far as the public provision of means for expressing and gratifying a natural healthy sentiment can justify and encourage it."

There is no doubt that penologists in the United States, Canada, and Great Britain, as well as other European countries, would repudiate Sir James' theory of hatred, but the majority of persons in these countries seem to think that we ought to inflict punishment on one who has done wrong, not only in justice to the criminal but in order to deter other people from perpetrating crime. The theory is that if you punish a man severely he will not repeat the offence, but will come to see that it does not pay to do wrong. And further, that the man who looks on will not do a like wrong—fear will be a deterrent. If the teaching of Theosophy be true, this theory of hatred of the criminal is all wrong, and this theory of fear as a deterrent is also wrong. All experience seems to be on the side of Theosophy. Take all the world's experience for a thousand years or more, and we shall find that fear as a deterrent has always failed. We have broken men on the wheel; we have boiled them alive; we have hung them. We have gathered the crowd around the gallows

*History of Criminal Law.

to see the execution that they might be afraid of crime. What has been the result? The man to be hung has made his speech and "*died game*." The crowds have dispersed, and those with criminal tendencies have plunged deeper into crime than they did before, and a wave of crime has swept over the country. The conclusion reached by careful observers is that severe penalties do not prevent crime, but rather instigate and multiply it. Theosophy teaches that no treatment of criminals can be right until we get rid of the notion that we are to hate the criminal and hurt him. Love is to be the motive and inspiration. He is our brother and we must love, pity, and try to redeem him and save him. Theosophy is optimistic and fills with hope all who gave themselves to this work of redemption. The prisoner pleads environment when you talk to him and truthfully says in many cases, "I never had a chance, I was brought up among thieves, prostitutes, and murderers just as Jerry McCauly and Michael Dunn were." Perhaps he came into human life later than we did, and given a little sympathy and help he will climb up to where we are. We forget that in past lives we, too, were plunged in ignorance and sin, and that, although we may be enlightened and cultured to-day, time was when we, too, were drunken, savage and criminal. These are our brothers who, perhaps, by our assistance will climb up to where we are, and higher, too—in a future life they may be saints and heroes. As the child is weak, ignorant and selfish but with the care and help of parents and teachers, together with the attrition of circumstance—struggles, sorrows, defeats—at last becomes strong, wise, patient, and kind, so it is with the race at large. If we have climbed up to a greater height it is our duty and privilege to reach down the hand to help those who are below us.

The wisest and best men of to-day are in many ways coming round to the teachings of Theosophy in this. Some years ago the Prison Congress gave this expression of opinion: "Under all circumstances a prisoner should be treated as a fellow being, and intelligent and affectionate efforts for his reformation should go hand in hand with all measures for his punishment." This is not the utterance of sentimental enthusiasts, but of men who have made a life study of prisons and prisoners. It is the authoritative affirmation of a scientific penology, and it stands opposed to the theory of hatred put forth by Sir James Stephens, and comes quite near to Theosophical teaching. In the light of Theosophy the death penalty is barbaric, inadequate, unscientific and unwise. It is not efficient as a deterrent, for capital crimes are more common in those states that impose the death penalty than they are in those states where the death penalty has been abolished. Theosophy explains why this is

so and can also tell us why there is an increase of crime after an execution of criminals. Capital punishment is defective as an instrument of justice, for all punishment should be salvatory and not destructive. By the law of brotherhood society is never relieved from its duty to try and reform the criminal when that is at all possible, and all retribution should be corrective. In the death penalty society evades its duty. Not only is capital punishment unmerciful, it is also irrational. It would be more rational to set the prisoner to work to maintain the bereaved family. "He should be punished," people say. Very well, there is no suffering which so efficiently protects society, or so completely subdues the prisoner as that which awakens his conscience to the wrong he has done. Compared with an indeterminate sentence, or a life sentence under moral discipline which will awaken remorse, the punishment effected by breaking a man's neck with a rope is infinitesimal. One is redemptive, the other is destructive; one is brotherly, the other is barbaric; one is rational, the other irrational; one is moral the other brutal.

Theosophy has a special word on this question that is spoken by no other philosophy or religion. It teaches that the desires and passions are not a part of the body, but constitute what is called the Fourth principle of man's constitution—*Kama-rupa*. These passions and desires are not produced by the body, but in one sense they are the cause of the body. When we kill the body by hanging, or electrocution, or in any other way, we do not kill this body of desires and passions. We set it free from the physical body, the instrument that it has been using, but sometime in the future it will cause to be born another physical instrument through which it will manifest itself. It is possible that it may be far more vicious in the next incarnation than in this, for malice and revenge may have been greatly strengthened and intensified by our treatment of it. If so, we have failed to do what we have intended to do, we have simply postponed the evil we should have met and conquered now. But this is not all. Teachers to whose vision the astral world is open have given us vivid but terrible pictures of these executed criminals as they exist on the Astral plane. Some of them are furious with terror and passionate, revengeful hatred. They surround themselves with an atmosphere of savage thought-forms, and are attracted to anyone in the physical body who is harboring revengeful or violent designs, and they push him on to the commission of the deed over which he broods. The loss of the physical body has deprived them of the power to indulge their appetites and passions, but they are still full of hatred, seething with revenge, and longing after physical indulgence. In this state it is said they

crowd around saloons and other bad places seeking to obsess men and women. There are thousands of men and women who are mediumistic, that is, sensitive to these unseen astral influences and are sometimes overcome by them. This is the explanation of the epidemics of crime that follow the execution of notorious criminals.

Perhaps the question may suggest itself, What about the judge, and jurors who condemn, and sheriff who executes this criminal? They are directly concerned with the death of this man; do they suffer more than the people who approve of their acts? These are serious questions that we may not be able to answer, but one thing we do know, and that is, that the law of Karma is the law of justice and of retribution by which the harmony of the universe that has been broken is restored. No one can inflict an injury upon another without himself experiencing the full effect of his acts.

"Such is the law which moves to righteousness,
Which none at last can turn aside or stay;
The heart of it is love: the end of it
Is peace and consummation sweet. Obey!"

He who by his life and by his words endeavors to spread abroad the principles and teachings of Theosophy, is a philanthropist and a patriot, for he is helping to solve the greatest problem of the century. If Theosophy could be universally lived, it would drive all selfishness out of commerce, education and religion, and write over every factory and store, every school and church, "Do ye unto others as you would have them do unto you," and the world would live in one great Brotherhood.

JOHN SCHOFIELD.

Life is like swimming. He who struggles uncertainly, fearful lest the water engulf him, sinks as the result of his own cowardly mistrust. But he who strikes out confidently, sure of its sustaining power, lies on its surface as safely as his peace lies in the heart of a friend. And so with life: Faith is the hallmark of invincibility.

L. E. P.



REVIEWS

Scientific Corroborations of Theosophy.—A vindication of the *Secret Doctrine* by the latest discoveries, by Dr. A. Marques. (Theosophical Publishing Society, London.)

The development of science in the last thirty years is a theme whose magical interest the dullest and most materialistic of historians could hardly obscure. It has not only revolutionised the conditions of human life, so that with M. Berthelot one might almost say that "a new man was being created in a new Earth," but it is continually opening for us vistas of worlds within worlds, and with the deepening revelation of the tremendous potency of the finer forces of nature has come a perception of the infinite reach of human life and its limitless possibilities. To students of Theosophy, especially, this record is of the most profound significance, for piece by piece it is filling in an outline, or a chart, given to them years ago in the writings of Madame Blavatsky. When, therefore, we find a book which purports to present not only the advances of science but to show their place in the theosophic doctrine, we must open it with the keenest and most pleasurable anticipations.

Such was our feeling when Dr. Marques' work came into our hands, and it is with no small sense of disappointment that we must record its failure to fulfil its promise. Perhaps we expected too much. As we reflect upon the magnitude of his theme, we see what unusual qualities must be possessed by the one who would expound it adequately. Both profound learning and sympathetic insight are demanded, and with them an intellectual modesty as indispensable for the true scientist as for the occultist. We might well forgive an author's failure to combine such rare qualifications, for we know how difficult each is to attain. But when all are lacking, the keenness of our disappointment makes us wonder why the task was essayed.

The book consists of ten chapters, attempting "a systematic review of the testimony of each science"—Electricity, Chemistry, Physiology, Astronomy, Physics, Geology and Palæontology, Archæology, Philology, and Anthropology,—and a closing effort to depict "the present outlook." The lay reader will find in these much of great interest, and very striking corroborations of H. P. B.'s teaching. But so much of discredited "newspaper science" is included, the false so hopelessly mingled with the true, and the distortions which result are so great, that the whole is not only unreliable but misleading. This is the more to be regretted in that the actual scientific attitude is to-day far closer to Theosophy than are its popular presentations,—far more liberal and open, as well as far more sane. It is very rarely that the true scientist is dogmatic. The worker on the confines of knowledge is too keenly aware of the extent of his ignorance, too constantly in the presence of the unknown, to permit him to share that sophomoric certainty and finality of conviction which characterize those whose knowledge is derived at second hand. We are forced to the conclusion that it is only with this popular reflection of science that Dr. Marques is acquainted, and that this fact accounts for his own attitude

toward it. On every page his presentation would lead us to believe that scientists, instead of devoting their lives to the attempt to advance human knowledge, were being driven forward against their will, and compelled "reluctantly to admit" this or that theosophic truth. He completely misses the true relation between theosophy and science: that the one is a view of truth from above, an insight which may be gained and verified by the soul; the other the slow and laborious movement of the lower mind, pushing its way into the finer realms of nature, often mistaken in its course, too often blind to the possibility of guidance from above, but always honest, always eager to advance so long as it can build at each step a road along which all may follow.

The failure to realize the significance of this relation shows as clearly and as unfortunately in Dr. Marques' conception and presentation of theosophy as in his concept of science. His theosophy is hardened and dogmatised. He would lead us to believe that it is a mental system differing in no way from modern science save in priority of publication, and in being true where science is false. He seems to forget that the truths of the spirit must be known of the spirit, and not of the mind; and that before we can really know the truth of H. P. B.'s teaching we must reach the viewpoint from which it may be seen. He is as ready to take his theosophy as his science at second hand,—and never questions the possibility that he is misunderstanding each.

But despite the resentment that this attitude must arouse both in the scientist and the theosophist, Dr. Marques' book contains, for those who can disentangle them, many most interesting and valuable parallels between H. P. B.'s teaching and modern science. Prophecy after prophecy is shown fulfilled, and we can see here, in brief compass, how on all sides science is filling in the theosophic teachings of evolution and the finer forces operative throughout the Cosmos as within the atom. If the book irritates it also stimulates, and for this Dr. Marques deserves our thanks.

The Inward Light, by H. Fielding Hall, author of *The Soul of a People*, etc. We hope to review this very remarkable book in the next issue of the QUARTERLY. For the moment, we can do no more than call it to the attention of our readers. It is a text-book, first of the theosophic attitude, and, secondly, of many doctrines which have come to be known as theosophical. The tolerance of its author is superb—and it is not the easy tolerance of the indifferent: it is the reasoned tolerance of a profoundly religious mind. He takes as his text the Buddhism of the Burmese. But he does not make the common mistake of trying to convert the West to an exotic form of religion. His appeal is to all who are mystically inclined, regardless of the terminology they prefer.

In the past, we, as Theosophists, have cried aloud for some brief and attractive statement of our philosophy. It seems almost as if those who do not call themselves Theosophists are doing this work for us more effectively than we could do it for ourselves. They have been influenced by the propaganda of the past thirty years, either consciously or without knowing it; and in some cases, as in this, it is quite evident that they have been influenced very directly also. The result is a book that we can put into the hands of almost any inquirer who would know of us, "What is Theosophy?" We, meanwhile, instead of giving time and energy to "authoritative statements"—the inevitable effect of which, if successful, would be to crystallize our views and to make our Society sectarian—can propagate the theosophic spirit by carrying it into every form of work which promises to benefit humanity. Merely to be able to recommend *The Inward Light*, and to know why we do so (how few people know *why* they do anything!); to be able to do such things deliberately, as from the soul and for the evocation of the soul in others—is service more valuable and more far-reaching than perhaps most of us suspect.

Apart even from that, the fact of recommending it should give us the opportunity to call attention later to the application of the same principles to Christianity and to other phases of contemporary thought. T.

The Cities of St. Paul; Their Influence on His Life and Thought, by Sir W. M. Ramsay, D.C.L. (A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York.) This is a very interesting attempt to show how St. Paul was influenced by, and, in his turn, influenced, the world of Greek thought of his day. But the author ploughs deep. He attacks the theory of evolution as applied to the history of religion. He repudiates the idea of primitive, in the sense of savage, beginnings. He sees religions as originally pure, although incomplete. Savagery he regards as degeneration. And he believes that St. Paul also held this view—a belief which we share with him. T.

Paul the Mystic, by the Rev. James M. Campbell, D.D. (G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York), has been written to prove what should not, but which does need proving, so far as the average churchgoer or minister is concerned, namely, that St. Paul was a mystic. We welcome most cordially the reverend doctor's contribution, which is so evidently the product of profound conviction. T.

The Winterfeast, the latest play by Charles Rann Kennedy, provides a clue to the understanding of *The Servant in the House*, which has met with such amazing success in New York City. *The Servant in the House* was supposed to be a plea for social justice. Actually, it was nothing of the sort. It was based upon utterly false sentiment. One incident sufficiently describes it—when the butler, who is also the Bishop of Calcutta and, incidentally, an incarnation of Christ, puts his arm round the neck of an impertinent page-boy and says: "Come along, little comrade!" Social injustice was supposed to be proved by the fact of social inequalities. Life itself was judged, not by its meaning and purpose, but by the quantity of comfort and general well-being distributed to each person. No such statement was made by the dramatist, but clearly his premises were that sickness and poverty and all other disagreeable experiences are evils; and that prosperity and comfort, and other physical conditions which are commonly classified as agreeable, are necessarily good, in and of themselves. Not for one moment does it seem to have occurred to him that the universe may exist for the purposes of soul; and that experiences, either agreeable or disagreeable, may be for the soul's education, rather than for the pleasure or discomfort of the personality.

In his new play, *The Winterfeast*, the setting of which is in Iceland in the year 1020 A. D., the same perverted idea of justice is the main subject of the plot. Newspaper critics speak of it as if it were intended to illustrate the strange workings of Fate, so dear to the old Greek dramatists. But while Æschylus and his compatriots, as the fundamental law of life, found that "whatsoever a man sows, that shall he also reap," Mr. Kennedy seems to regard Fate as a purely arbitrary and cantankerous creature, whose methods are haphazard when not positively spiteful. Ostensibly, the play has no sociological application. Mr. Kennedy's sociological views are so well known, however, that one must suppose a deeper intention than appears upon the surface of *The Winterfeast*. His moral, then, would seem to be that human life, and its organized expression in society, are wholly chaotic and purposeless; and that man, being unsupported by any natural or divine law of justice, is unable even to act justly in his relations with his fellow men. We do not mean that Mr. Kennedy sets out deliberately to establish any such thesis. On the contrary, he puts into the mouth of one of his characters the wholly satisfactory remark that "lie engenders lie." This sagacity, unfortunately, is merely spasmodic; the fact being that Mr. Kennedy is confused, and that, in this last of his plays, he gives unconscious but complete expression to the mental chaos which *The Servant in the House* revealed only to those who have

seriously studied the problems over the surface of which he skims.—Since the above was written, public announcement has been made that *The Winterfeast* will at once be withdrawn from the boards. X.

We have been turning over the pages of *The Theosophist* for December, 1908—rather pensively and regretfully, it must be confessed, for we remember the great, by-gone days when it flamed with the splendor and light of H. P. B. One Editorial Note demands comment. This Note suggests that “in 1895, the American Section of the T. S., led by Mr. Judge, left the original Society and established itself on independent lines,” thus “rending the seamless coat.” In reality, the “seamless coat” was rent, not in 1895, but in 1894, when certain members brought accusations against Mr. Judge, in violation of the Society’s fundamental principle of tolerance and religious liberty. Those who made these attacks, and those who acquiesced in them, thereby departed from the firm foundation laid by H. P. B.—the foundation of genuine toleration and liberty of belief. What Mr. Judge did, was to draw closer the bonds of brotherhood and fellowship among those who, with him, adhered loyally to the fundamental principle of the Society, the steadfast practice of genuine toleration. Our views on this fundamental question have been stated in detail many times, in *THE THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY*, for example in our issues for July, 1907, and July, 1908; to which we refer those who desire to go deeper into the matter.

C. J.

MAGAZINE LITERATURE.

The Open Court for October contains much of interest. In a short contribution by Dr. Paul Carus on “The Sixth Sense,” he mentions that Mrs. Lucy MacDowell Milburn, the well-known lecturer on Christian and Greek Art, has suggested that the passage in Rev. XVII, 10, where we read of seven kings of whom “five are fallen, one is, and the other is not yet come,” refers to the “seven senses” of which five have “fallen,” or have become contaminated with sensuality, while the one that “is” refers to the sense of dreams (?), and that the other that “is not yet come” means the spiritual sense to be developed in the millennium which shall precede the end of the world. The November issue is disappointing. T.

The Monist for October contains the third installment of Teitaro Suzuki’s “Brief History of Early Chinese Philosophy,” dealing now with its religious aspect. These articles show considerable research, but such an utter lack of comprehension that the result is almost irritating. Mr. Suzuki is a Japanese. We doubt whether this gives him any special right to dogmatize about the meaning of Taoism, which was typically a Chinese product. He says that the Taoists “seem to have had nothing especially to do with the worship of God,” and although the use of “seem” might have saved him if he had left well alone, he commits himself in the next sentence to the positive statement that Taoism is not religious in the proper sense of the word, but “practical, moral and rationalistic”; also “highly speculative.” Lao-tsze was a mystic among mystics; so were his immediate followers. Mr. Suzuki appears to have no glimmer of what mysticism means. Consequently, mystics are not religious. The same issue contains an article by Herbert Chatley entitled, “Mediæval Occultism,” which should have been called “Mediæval Magic.” The author attempts to establish the proposition that “Ritual is a suggestive series of acts, and as such is conformable to the laws of suggestion.” From which he infers that “theurgic magic has a claim to serious consideration.” It is an interesting subject, even from that point of view; but the article is too short to be of permanent value. T.

The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology, and Scientific Methods, Nos. 21 to 24, provides reading of great value to advanced students of these subjects. The "Reviews and Abstracts of Literature," which always show conscientious study, should be particularly helpful to university professors and to all teachers whose duty requires them to keep track of the flood of new literature of a technical or abstruse character. Mr. George A. Coe's treatment of Professor H. B. Mitchell's *Talks on Religion*, is disappointing. But this is perhaps due to the fact that we read with so much pleasure the unusually able and sympathetic reviews of the same book which appeared in *Current Literature*, and in *The North American Review*, the latter by Mr. G. C. Mars.

T.

The New Age Magazine, formerly *The New Theology Magazine*, is treading on dangerous ground. In its November issue it reprints an article by Thomas Lake Harris, whose career was so consistent an expression of his principles that Madame Blavatsky found it necessary, more than once, to refer very plainly to both; and it publishes an article on "The Meaning of the Cross," being "Teachings of the Order of the 15," in which we are told that "the third utterance, 'Woman, behold thy son,' is a recognition of the feminine principle, or the mother side of God, and the purity and sacredness of sex." This is to carry sex, as a permanent principle, into the spiritual world; and although this may seem a harmless and purely theoretical lapse, long experience has demonstrated that few things are more dangerous. The ultimate step of all is said to be that at which the disciple has found "the real center of life, the one central point which can send the life-force through the two, and the two become one flesh." It is to be hoped that the "Order of the 15" do not know what they are talking about. In any case, this cannot be repeated too often: God and the spiritual world are above sex.

T.

Theosophisches Leben, for September, October and November, contains more original matter than usual, some of it of a very high order. It is a thoroughly representative theosophical magazine. A sample copy will be sent free of charge on application to Paul Raatz, Theosoph. Verlag, Wilhelm-strasse 120, Berlin, S. W. 48. There must be many Germans in this country who, both for their own pleasure and instruction, and in order to encourage this excellent work in the Fatherland, would be glad to become regular subscribers. In any case we hope so; for it would be difficult to express adequately our interest in the welfare of this organ of the Theosophischen Gesellschaft in Deutschland.

T.

We have also received *The Light of Reason* for October; *The Herald of the Cross* for November; the *Historic Magazine* and *Notes and Queries* for November.

A CALENDAR OF ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY.

For some years past the Denver Branch has rendered a very valuable service in publishing calendars containing quotations from theosophic literature. It is as real a help as it is a pleasure to live surrounded with touchstones of the inner life and incentives to high thoughts, and all our thanks are due to the members in Denver for the judgment and taste they have used in preparing these artistic sheets. The selections for the coming year are from the religious thought of many past civilizations, culled from the Hermetic philosophy of Greece and the sacred books of Egypt, no less than from the scriptures of ancient India and China. The print and decorative borders are most pleasing. The calendars may be obtained from the Secretary T. S., for 25 cents.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

QUESTION 63 (*Continued*).—*What is the best way to resist temptation?*

ANSWER.—Dwell upon the opposite virtue, and insist to yourself that you possess it. If, for example, you habitually gossip and are given to saying clever things which have a little sting behind them, then consider constantly the silent things of life—the profound stillness of nature—and the appointed courses of the stars. Think of yourself as one with these, of your ideal of non-interference, of doing your own duty, of never speaking without a purpose, of tolerance and of charity. As you fill your mind with such thoughts the desire for idle, vain chattering will drop away from you. Or if you feel it you will recognize it as the small mean thing it is—no part of your true self. So as you disassociate yourself from it in thought you will become free from it in act. But if on the other hand you try to approach it directly by saying “I must remember not to gossip;” “It would not be kind to repeat that funny story of Mrs. ——,” then your mind is constantly full of the very thing you wish to free it from, and sooner or later we act out what is in our mind. N.

QUESTION 91.—*What is true occultism and how can one practise it?*

ANSWER.—True occultism is the science of the Soul. This science has a theoretical and a practical aspect. The theoretical aspect consists of a philosophy which teaches the laws of the Soul. These teachings, called esoteric philosophy, have been given from time to time to mankind by those who have proved their truth by living according to the laws contained therein. They not only teach but have *become* that which they teach.

The study of this esoteric philosophy (theoretical occultism) is of the greatest importance, and, in fact, a necessity for those who wish to become practical occultists. In every branch of science, however, study and practice are not identical, and no one can become a practical occultist solely by occupying himself with the esoteric philosophy or by studying ancient and modern Sanscrit works. Practical occultism cannot be pursued by holding spiritualistic séances or by endeavoring to obtain any information whatever with the assistance of a medium. Neither is practical occultism knowledge and practice of the powers of human magnetism or hypnotism. These are occult arts and to the inexperienced more or less fraught with danger; they are in no wise occultism. To attain this there is only one path: to live the life taught in esoteric philosophy. For instance, esoteric philosophy teaches that the whole universe is a conscious *unity*, finding its manifestation in the world-soul; and practical occultism consists in each individual seeking to attain a consciousness of unity with the world-soul—seeking to *become* this unity, of which he holds himself to be an isolated part, as long as he feels his separation from other beings.

Overcoming this sense of separateness is practical occultism. The way is self-

sacrifice, thinking of others more than of one's self, seeking to promote the progress of others more than one's own.

Striving to become conscious of the unity of all things, living and working in this unity, as drops of water in the great ocean—this is practical occultism!

Y.

ANSWER.—Occultism has been defined as doing the right thing in the right way at the right time and in the right place. I do not know of a better definition. How to practise it is very much like the next question in this issue of the QUARTERLY, "What is the best method of making the ideal real?" It seems to me that the best way of practising occultism is to practise occultism, or in other words, and in the language of the definition, to do the right thing in the right way, at the right time, and in the right place.

G.

QUESTION 92.—*What is the best mode of making the ideal real?*

ANSWER.—In the first place it is necessary to have a definite ideal to work towards.

Next, we should perform each duty nearest at hand to the very best of our ability every day and every hour of the day, looking always to the Higher Self for wisdom to discriminate as to what is duty.

The great trouble with many earnest students is the seeming multiplicity of duties; then the question arises how to perform them all satisfactorily. Suppose, then, we simply perform the duties nearest to us, all that we comfortably can, and do them well, will they not be better done than they would, should we endeavor to spread out our work, our influence, our help, over more ground than we can comfortably cover?

Let us look ever to the Higher Self—the God within—the Father—for guidance, and then resolve to do our utmost to follow this guidance, constantly endeavoring to fit ourselves to express it more adequately, leaving the result to Him who doeth all things well.

C. G. G.

ANSWER.—Some years ago an American statesman gave utterance to a dictum which became famous: "The best way to resume specie payments is to resume." A paraphrase of that saying would appear to be the proper answer to the question. The best method of making the ideal real is to make the ideal real. What more is there to say? Every human being's way of doing this will differ from every other human being's, but the main point is that it shall be done. One might as well ask, "What is the best way to be good?" There isn't any best way of being good. All ways of being good are good ways of being good.

G.

ANSWER.—The "best mode of trying to make the ideal real" is to realise constantly in a steady undercurrent of thought, that each human being is ultimating his own ideal. Each race expresses its highest ideal, and then calls this highest conception, "god." It is not safe to try to do more than shape one's *own* ideal. Trying to help anyone else to shape the same ideal or live up to another, not his own, free choice, is not conducive to "sweet Peace and rest, Disciple." . . . Become your own ideal, if you honestly can't find a better one, but be quiet about it, when found. You will then live longer, and raise your standard higher and escape that tired feeling!

D. P.

QUESTION 93.—*What may be the duty of a Theosophist to himself?*

ANSWER.—"To control and conquer, through the Higher Self, the lower self. To purify himself inwardly and morally; to fear no one, and naught, save the tribunal of his own conscience. Never to do a thing by halves; *i. e.*, if he thinks it the right thing to do, let him do it openly and boldly, and if wrong, never touch it at

all. It is the duty of a Theosophist to lighten his burden by thinking of the wise aphorism of Epictetus, who says: 'Be not diverted from your duty by an idle reflection the silly world may make upon you, for their censures are not in your power, and consequently should not be any part of your concern.'"

H. P. B.

QUESTION 94.—*Please give reasons and facts why religious teachings, that is to say, the teachings of the churches, have failed to raise the standard of morals?*

ANSWER.—I cannot give such reasons and facts because they do not exist. The smallest knowledge of history proves that the teachings of the churches have raised the standard of morals, and are continuing to raise the standard of morals, to an immense degree.

Does the querent know anything about past standards of morals? Does he know, for instance, that the moral tone of the Greeks, at the height of their wonderful civilization in the golden age of Pericles, was so low from our present standpoint that we can no longer even refer to the obscene and bestial practices which were then universal?

Does he know of the morals of ancient Rome, of Egypt, of Assyria, of Chaldea, of things which when referred to at all in our histories, are always put in those untranslatable Latin footnotes?

Or take later times, the Middle Ages in Europe, and read the "History of European Morals." We cannot rise from such a book with any doubt whatever about the steady improvement in our ethical standards.

There is a great deal of nonsense written about the church and its influence. The plain fact is that with all its faults and shortcomings, in spite of the crimes committed by it and in its name, in spite of Inquisitions and persecutions, narrowness and dogmatism of belief, the general influence of the church has been for good and it has had an incalculably beneficial effect upon moral standards.

C. A. G., JR.

QUESTION 95.—*Jesus proved himself a Master of life by healing the sick, and declared that that power accompanied belief in his doctrine. Was this physical healing only a myth or figurative language? If not, could not a Theosophist, if he would, find a scientific basis in Theosophy for metaphysical healing, and thus step by step become master of so-called physical infirmities?*

ANSWER.—It would require a book to answer adequately such a far-reaching question and it would also require much greater knowledge than is possessed by the present writer.

I believe that Jesus healed the sick. I am convinced that belief in His doctrines will confer the power to heal the sick, if by "belief" we mean that His Doctrines are *lived* and become a part of the consciousness and nature of the disciple. I also believe that a Theosophist can find a scientific basis for so-called metaphysical healing and thus become a master of physical infirmities. But after we have said this, what do we mean? What do we mean by metaphysical healing?

Presumably metaphysical healing is the cure of physical infirmities by non-physical means; by methods other than those of orthodox medicine, as for instance, by the influence of mind over matter, or by some super-physical force or energy. It will be seen at once how enormous is the field covered by such a definition, for it would include every variety of healing known or suspected by man. As a matter of fact there is no reason to doubt that there are at least as many different kinds of metaphysical healing as there are planes or forces above the purely physical plane, for each of these super-physical planes must have a force which is capable of influencing the matter of our bodies and therefore may make what we call cures.

This is what makes the subject so exceedingly difficult. We have a very little empirical knowledge about two or three planes or forces which lie close to the physical plane and we have learned how to manipulate these forces to some extent and in a purely mechanical way, without in the least knowing what we are doing. We get curative effects which sometimes are quite remarkable, and we have much reason to believe that at the same time we may be doing other things which more than counterbalance the good effects of the physical cure. But as these bad results are intangible and often take a long time to manifest, or remain always as a weakness on the mental or psychic plane, it is very difficult to persuade people to believe in their reality, while on the other hand they can see the immediately curative results.

I cannot pretend to give a list of the different kinds of metaphysical healing, but we are all familiar with several of them. There is the beneficial effect of propinquity to a person of abundant physical vigor. Old people are said to be strengthened by sleeping with young and healthful persons and to derive a feeling of invigoration from such association. "Laying on of hands," as it is sometimes called, is another kind of healing, due probably to the unconscious dissemination of physical magnetism. Much massage and perhaps a good deal of the benefit derived from osteopathy come within this category.

There is another class where the healer deliberately uses his magnetic power by act of conscious will. Colonel Olcott performed many remarkable cures by this means in the early days of the Society. The rationale of it is obscure. It may be that the magnetism of the healer flowing into the patient tends to regulate the congested condition or supplies a deficiency of nerve force; but there is probably more to it than this, and the plain fact is that we do not know how these obscure forces work. Faith in the ability of the healer to effect a cure is a very important element, perhaps often the main element in the remarkable results sometimes obtained.

It is clear that the healing abilities of people will differ in a very marked degree, according to the amount and character of their magnetism and its relation to the particular lack of the patient. A healer might well have control over stores of magnetic power, but its mere possession would be no indication of occult knowledge or the power to use it wisely.

Then there is healing by hypnosis. Here we touch a wide field where almost complete ignorance is paramount. The curative power in such cases would appear to come often from the higher nature of the patient, hypnotism serving merely to make quiescent the lower nature, the brain and personality, so that the higher power can operate undisturbed. It is probable that in some cases, such as Christian Science, the curative influence also comes from the subliminal part of the healer as well as from the patient.

Then there are the fully conscious and magnificent manifestations of healing power which are given by Christ and by other "divine" men. About the rationale of these we do not know enough even to speculate intelligently. Evidently the querent or any one else who wants to become a "master of physical infirmities" must follow the same "small old Path reaching to the Eternal" which Christ pointed out and which every other spiritual teacher has urged upon his followers. And until he has progressed some distance upon this Path and has learned a great deal more about these things than we know now, I would strongly recommend that he leave them very much alone.

B. N. B.

T·S·ACTIVITIES

IN NORWAY.

It is with a deep sense of pleasure—the greater because it will be shared by all members of the Society, that we print the following letters, heralding closer union with our comrades in Norway. Within two years it has been our privilege to welcome the strong accession to our membership of the British and German National Branches, and this further strengthening of our international brotherhood is a matter of profound congratulation to us all. As will be seen from Colonel Knoff's letter, the action now taken by the Norwegian Theosophical Association is a direct result of the decision of the last convention of the T. S. to return in name, as well as in fact, to the original international character of the Society, and is a further proof of the wisdom of that decision.

CHRISTIANIA, November 14, 1908.

To the Secretary T. S.

Comrade: Enclosed I send you a formal application from the former T. S. in Norway, now called in English "The Norwegian Theosophical Association" (abbreviated "N. T. A.") in Christiania, to be chartered as a Branch of the international Theosophical Society, whose headquarters are in New York, U. S. A.

As far as I remember I have earlier sent to Mr. Johnston, the chairman of the Executive Committee, a translated copy of the present constitution of our society, wherefore I have not now enclosed another copy with the application for a charter for our Branch.

As to the annual dues of our Branch to the headquarters, I propose that these should be 20 cents for each member, which is, as far as I know, a little more than the dues paid for each member of the German Branch. If I am mistaken on this point, I will add that our Branch is willing to pay the same dues as the German Branch.

Looking forward with hope and joy to the time when our little Branch is again reunited with the one international Theosophical Society, I am

Fraternally yours,

T. S. KNOFF.

CHRISTIANIA, November 14, 1908.

To the Executive Committee of the Theosophical Society, New York, U. S. A.

At the Annual Convention in 1907 of "the Norwegian Theosophical Association," in Christiania it was resolved that this Society should make terms about joining the Theosophical Society in America, as soon as the latter proved its international character by dropping the words "in America" in its name. As this alteration of name has taken place at your Annual Convention in April this year, we have now—on behalf of the Norwegian Theosophical Association—to apply to you about this matter.

Our former Constitution, with some additional rules, of which a copy follows, shall form the By-Laws of our Branch. From the additional rules you will learn that our Branch has resolved to abide by the Constitution of the Theosophical Society, the principles of its By-Laws and the rules for Branches, there laid down.

We apply now for a Charter for the Norwegian Theosophical Association as a Branch of the Theosophical Society, and we submit our By-Laws to your approval.

A list with the names of the members of our Society, and their addresses, follows.

O. HOUÏE, CARL SJÖSTEDT, T. S. KNOFF.

BY-LAWS

of "The Norwegian Theosophical Association,"

organized in Christiania, as a Branch of the international Theosophical Society with Headquarters in New York, U. S. A.

1. "*The Norwegian Theosophical Association*" (N. T. A.) in Christiania shall be a Branch of "*The Theosophical Society*," whose headquarters are in New York, U. S. A.

2. The official name in English of this Branch is: "*The Norwegian Theosophical Association*" (abbreviated: "N. T. A.")

3. Its future Constitution shall be that of the Theosophical Society.

4. Its present Constitution shall form the fundamental part of the By-Laws of this Branch.

5. As a Branch of the Theosophical Society it shall abide by the principles and rules for Branches, laid down in the By-Laws of this Society.

6. The annual dues of this Branch to the headquarters shall be twenty (20) cents for each member.

7. Application for membership shall be countersigned by two members of the Branch.

IN ENGLAND.

From England comes the best of news. The London Branch is holding public lectures regularly, attended by audiences of over a hundred, and reports steadily increasing interest and sympathy. Two booklets which have just reached us as this goes to press, come with the information that the edition printed has already been exhausted, so great and unexpected was the demand for elementary Theosophic literature. The first of these, "*The Influence of Theosophy in Daily Life*," by Dr. Keightley, is printed elsewhere in this issue of the magazine. The second, "*The Theosophical Society, Its History and Constitution*," is a happy offspring of the close union between the English and American Branches, as the first part is contributed by an American member and the second by the President of one of the Branches in the north of England.

IN GERMANY.

Under date of November 1st we have received a report of the opening of the winter's work in the German Branches. According to custom public lectures and propaganda were generally suspended during the mid-summer, though a few of the Branches, among them that at Munich, continued their meetings without break. In the early autumn full activity was resumed in all the Branches, and substantial gains both in membership and work have been recorded.

In Berlin a new Branch has been formed at Südende, a southern suburb, and it has begun its work with 15 members. The public lectures of the various Berlin Branches now claim almost the whole week. On Monday the North Berlin Branch

has its lectures; on Tuesday, the Branch at Südende, while Wednesday and Friday evenings are taken by the mother "Berlin Branch" and the Branch in West Berlin, respectively. On Saturday, twice in each month, the members of all the Branches come together for study. These meetings are not of as public a character as the others, and this autumn "The Voice of the Silence" has been chosen as the text-book. In addition to this long roll of meetings, which makes of Berlin one of the most active centers of propaganda in the Society, the Berlin Branch opens its rooms each month for a social gathering, at which Mrs. Raatz has given English lectures on Theosophical themes for the benefit of those who wish to learn or improve their English. November 18th was set by the Berlin Branch for a great public meeting, Mr. Wiederhold speaking on "Repentance and Self Redemption."

Though the Berlin Branches have set a high standard of work, the other German Branches have been no less active. From Dresden, from München, from Suhl and Flensburg and Neusalz come reports of interesting lectures, of new opportunities, or of accessions to membership. One of the most promising and fruitful features of their work is the co-operation between the Branches in the exchange of visits and of speakers. Thus the Branch in München visited that in Suhl, where Mr. Frölich spoke to the question, "Why are we on earth?" and at the celebration of "the third birthday" of the Neusalz Branch, Mr. Weiss of Berlin lectured on "The Objects of the Theosophical Society."

With the newly constituted Branch at Südende the T. S. in Germany consists now of ten Branches. They have raised the question as to whether they should continue their formal union among themselves as the German National Branch of the T. S., for administrative purposes, or take their stand as individual Branches of the international T. S. The two are of course entirely compatible, as they were represented and voted at the last T. S. convention at Dayton, Ohio, as individual Branches, on the same footing as the Branch in New York or in Cincinnati, while they meet together in local convention to discuss the work in Germany.

We cannot refrain from quoting, and we earnestly join in the prayer with which their report closes: "May the Spirit of Theosophy work through our Branches and help to strengthen the great Spiritual rebirth that is taking place in Germany."

IN AMERICA.

It is to further this spiritual rebirth, taking place not only in Germany but all over the world and most clearly in America, that the American Branches are directing their chief efforts. And because this new spiritual life is manifesting itself in all departments of our national thought—in science as well as in our churches, in civic reform and in the effort to bring all classes together for better understanding and helpfulness, in literature and in art, and in philosophy—because in each of these this new Spirit breathes and struggles for expression, the real work of the Branches in America, in seeking to further the movement of the Spirit, is of necessity very diverse and often impossible to record.

THE NEW YORK T. S.

This has been the case with the work in New York, where in the three great divisions of Christianity (the Greek, the Roman Catholic, and the Protestant Churches), in the universities, in the magazines and daily papers, in the national organizations which have here their centers, the members of the Society have worked for the recognition of the reality of the religious life and for the spread of brotherhood. In addition the regular open meetings of the Society have been continued with constantly growing interest and attendance.

THE CINCINNATI BRANCH.

The following letter and syllabus from the Secretary of the Cincinnati Branch are typical of the way in which the winter's work in the Middle Western States has opened, and might easily be paralleled in the reports from Indianapolis and Dayton and other centers.

To the Secretary T. S.

Dear Friend and Co-Worker: Enclosed please find application for membership and money order for two dollars, for Mr. ——. By adding his name to the membership roll, I feel that we have secured a sincere worker, and an earnest searcher for truth. I also enclose syllabus cards for this season's work. The subjects, I think, are all good, and I look forward to a season's good work. I feel that we did some very good work last season, judging by the increased attendance, and by the earnest inquiries of the visitors. I cannot believe that these people come night after night to hear the subjects discussed, just for curiosity's sake, for we have nothing to amuse them, but on the contrary I think they come to receive the truths we have to give. Therefore I feel very much encouraged and feel that we will spread the truth farther and wider this season. The students here all seem to realize the importance of the noble purpose for which we are working, and the thought we keep in mind is, "Live the Life and you will know the Doctrine." With this uppermost in your mind, and working along this line always, you cannot do otherwise than help and benefit the noble purpose of Theosophy. At our annual election the following officers were chosen: Dr. Tenney, President; Mr. E. A. Allen, Vice-President; Mr. F. C. Benninger, Secretary-Treasurer; Miss M. D. Hohnstedt, Librarian.

[Signed] F. C. BENNINGER, *Secretary*.

SYLLABUS.

- | | |
|---|---|
| Jan. 5—Personality, Individuality and Heredity. | Mar. 23—Quo Vadis. |
| " 12—Emerson. | " 30—Man's Relation to the Lower Animals. |
| " 19—What Shall I Do to be Saved? | Apr. 6—Brotherhood. |
| " 26—Death and After. | " 13—Are All Experiences Necessary? |
| Feb. 2—To be Announced. | " 20—To be Announced. |
| " 9—Am I My Brother's Keeper? | " 27—Karma. |
| " 16—Individual Responsibility. | May 4—Involution and Evolution. |
| " 23—Where and What Is Heaven? | " 11—Lotus Day. |
| Mar. 2—Spiritualism. | " 18—Imagination. |
| " 9—To be Announced. | " 25—Closing Exercises. |
| " 16—Reincarnation. | |

IN CANADA.

The Branch in Toronto has resumed its regular Sunday and Friday meetings, and the Secretary reports, in addition to an increase in membership, that "Things are more promising than they have been since the formation of our Branch and I feel delighted." Their class for the study of the New Testament has been particularly successful and numbers from 40 to 45.

IN SOUTH AMERICA.

From Caracas there is similar news—a constant deepening of interest and a steadily growing demand for what Theosophy has to give.

This is the word that comes to us from all over the world. In the words of our German brothers, may we so live and labor as "to let the Spirit of Theosophy live through us" and meet this demand.

H. B. M.



The Theosophical Society, as such, is not responsible for any opinion or declaration in this magazine, by whomsoever expressed, unless contained in an official document.

THOSE that shall come after us will look back to this our day, and speak of it as the time of promise, the first early dawn of a wonderful age. They will see rich and ample fruition, where we, perchance, behold but the early blossom of the orchard: they will gather golden sheaves from the fields where we see but the timid green blade of promise and hope. Yet there is a loveliness and a wonder in the green blade, the first bloom of the fruit-trees, which vanishes as dawn vanishes, and is seen no more. Let us, therefore, who are dwelling in the dawn, in the first days of the spring time, open our eyes to the miracle of beauty and of hope that surrounds us.

There are times when one can see the mind of mankind changing; when some mood, long held and deemed permanent, has almost impalpably faded, giving place to another. Such a time of transition came in most ancient Egypt, when impurity crept in, and men lost faith; losing, with faith, the golden age when the gods walked with men. Thereon came age upon age of foreign domination, of servitude, of degradation. And even to-day mother Egypt is under the yoke, a thrall, a serf, where she should be a queen. Such a time came in India, when the ancient race of kings, falling from the high tradition of their prime, drew the sword in a war of brothers and kinsmen, and the iron age began. Thereafter, the history of India is a tale of gathering woes, with but one bright interlude when the Buddha came, bringing his message of love and resignation and the eternal Silence. India, too, like Egypt, doomed herself to long ages of degradation and servitude, until the time of the bondage shall be fulfilled.

Such a climacteric came in Hellas, when the clear and soaring Grecian spirit forgot its high ideals and declined upon lower aims.

The Greeks themselves no longer remembered the bright inspiration of the realm "that standeth fast forever. Not by winds is it shaken, nor ever wet with rain, nor doth the snow come nigh thereto, but most clear air is spread about it cloudless, and the white light floats over it. Therein the blessed immortals rejoice for ever." They gave to the world their marvelous revelation of the beauty of holiness, of the exquisite loveliness of the divine thought; and then they fell below their inspiration, sinking to baser ways and less worthy purposes. So to Hellas also came the conqueror, and the glory passed away.

There was a like change in our own era, among the nations from whom we more directly spring. Time was, when the princes and priests of our western peoples really believed in God. The prayer of a king was not mere political ceremony, but a humble petition from the heart. The service of God was not a form, but a living, thrilling reality, for which men would die rejoicing. In our great cathedrals, serene in their lovely silence, we have the records of that time of genuine belief; cathedrals designed we know not by whom, nor do we know the names of the builders. They came forth from an age of faith and joy, as Ilion rose into towers at the song of Apollo.

Faith ebbed in king and priest and people. Sensualism, ambition, the love of lucre, corroded many hearts; and with the loss of faith, the heavens darkened, till men lived between an earth of iron and a sky of brass. Faith ebbed from hearts and minds alike, leaving them hardened in their selfishness, and cold with doubt and fear. Though men kept divine names on their lips, and spoke of immortality, it was but a poor and starved belief, compared with the glow of triumphant faith, the high delight of earlier times. Men spoke, indeed, of the divine, but lived with eyes downcast, their thoughts fixed on mortality.

Such an age of materialism of thought, coming in the train of unworthy action and infidelity to high duties, reached its culmination something more than a century ago. The scepticism and materialism of the eighteenth century ran through statecraft, politics, commerce, art. The Church, though asserting firm faith, had fallen into hardness and intolerance; certain signs that no true faith was there. The inward apostasy of the Church had exiled science, divorcing it from religion, and science had suffered profoundly from this exile, growing hostile, hard, incredulous, atheistic.

As water runs downhill, so did this wickedness in high places gradually find its way downwards, until the whole of life came to be saturated with practical unbelief. State and Church alike followed low ambition rather than high and worthy accomplishment. Base ideals became universal. But the mood of mankind has, in the last few years, been slowly changing—turning from the baser to the nobler, from sheer materialism to something of spiritual faith. Already the change has gone far enough, imperceptible and impalpable as it has been, to alter the perspective of life, and we can take advantage of the new point of view already gained, to weigh and sum up the ideals of the age immediately behind us.

To begin with, there is a low ideal of life. It is not enough to say that there is little practical belief in immortality. That of itself would not be enough to degrade and cheapen life. A certain sad nobility and heroic resignation may consist with the thought that life is ended by death; there may be much loving-kindness and tender mercy. There is an atheism more religious than some professions of belief. No, the baseness of our ideals had another source. It sprang, not from failure to grasp the great truth of immortality, its sublime and inspiring horizons; but rather from a certain cheapness and lowness of purpose, a readiness to find satisfaction in unworthy things, a servile preference for debased coinage.

This coarseness and cheapness of taste showed most clearly in our ideal of success. For that is, after all, the practical index of our religion, of the belief we really hold. We are in the habit, somewhat lightly, of congratulating ourselves on the passing of feudalism, thanking God that we live rather in a commercial age. But is the change so certainly for the better? After all, the ideal of success in a feudal age was in many things higher. The great man of those days, the man admired and sung by the poets, must possess not only power, but personal courage, the instant readiness to meet death, a certain grace and beauty of manner, a personal fineness and charm. And in all true feudalism, the great man, the lord, was a true protector and cherisher of the poor, who, on that condition, rendered him service. Such a feudal master of men represented a not unworthy ideal of success; and his fame was handed down in heroic ballads and courtly poetry.

Is not the cheap fame dispensed by our purchasable and impertinent journalism a true index of our baser ideal of success? To be mentioned in a hundred flimsy and ill-written papers, on pages adorned with the portraits of murderers and heroines of scandal:

that is our ideal of fame. To see one's name bandied about in the cheap daily gossip, wedged in, perhaps, between the story of a prize-fight and a railroad wreck, that is our latter-day ideal of fame, fame "the spur that the clear spirit doth raise; that last infirmity of noble mind." That is something of a descent from the days when the old Troubadours made fame, with their lovely ballads of bravery and love. To be envied by thousands of small minds and narrow hearts; to have the power to parade the things that provoke envy; to be able to order others about, and be seen ordering them about; that is our latter-day ideal of success. And all that makes for this fine triumph is good. The rest is futile and foolish.

So has it been for a long time now. But the old order changes. The mind of man is entering a new mood. The old, firm and stable things give signs of changing. Ideals are altering, with an altering view of life. That change is but beginning. We are in the first whiteness of the dawn; the early spring-time, when spring is still half-wintery. Therefore for us there is this great and winsome marvel, to see the new day first sparkling into color and light, to watch the blossoms bursting from the bud, in the fine, inaudible music of spring. When full summer comes, with warm days and clear skies, all men will know it; taking, indeed, for granted the great beneficence of the sunlight. But ours is the finer and rarer privilege, to be present at the very miracle of the second birth.

Our privilege is even greater. We may not only witness, we may aid, the coming of the morning, after our long night. First among the signs of returning light, will be a steady raising of ideals, and most of all the ideal of success. The criterion for the new day will be, not the cheap envy of multitudes, but the true heart's reward of doing the best for its own sake, for love of the best. We shall seek to live our lives, not as mere imitations of the "successful men" who parade themselves before us, but rather in obedience to the quiet ideal in the heart; that eloquent silence, which ever urges us to true deeds, clean thoughts and worthy purposes. We shall no longer make it our aim to become such magnates as our light-minded multitudes worship, to gather about us the furniture of success, great heaps of showy things that evoke envy. We shall have a nobler aim: to live our lives in something of the spirit of the pure artist, the humble and devoted saint, in order that they may be excellent, ringing true as good coin does, resting on real values, not on shallow and showy appearances. Each one of us will find our commendation in the quiet judgment of our own souls, not in the

cheap and fickle fame of our purchasable journals and their light-minded readers.

Once it is realised that the soul's commendation is the true success, all life about us will begin to lighten, as the sky lightens after the passing of a storm. Almost imperceptibly, we shall think ourselves back again into the mood of immortality, so that on some marvelous and memorable morn we shall wake up to find ourselves immortal, knowing that immortality really is. Thereafter life may have its gloom and sombre shadows, but they will only serve to heighten the everlasting light. And in that light all things shall be transmuted and transformed. What seemed, in the dusk of our night, to be a vast pillar of gloom, will reveal itself in the white of dawn as the splendid column of the tree of life; what seemed a dark, impassible chasm, shall appear in the growing light as the river of the water of life, its banks lovely with the flowers of immortality.

In that dawn of the new and everlasting day, all things shall take on a new and marvelous face. Poverty, no longer an obsessing and hideous privation, the veritable hell of the materialist heart, will be seen in its true light as a cleansing and purifying presence, the true school of courage, fortitude, gentle sympathy, kindness of heart. Thereafter poverty, in our sense, will be impossible. In the quaint simile of the East, we thought, in the dark, that we saw a serpent; the growing light shows us that the serpent was really a cord, good for binding together a bundle of virtues. We realise that the serpent of poverty is no longer there. More than that, we realise that there never was a serpent, except in our own fearful hearts.

When the serpent vanishes, when the fear of poverty fades away in the light of morning, with it will go the foolish and timid craving for wealth. For that craving is ever a mean and cowardly matter. The craven heart fears that, endowed only with the soul and the universe, it cuts but a sorry figure, and longs to bolster up its littleness with the things we call wealth: quantities of furniture, pockets full of wages for poor folk, who gather round us to do our bidding, and so give us the sense of being real and solid, which we have failed to gain from our souls. When the soul is found, or rather when we make the first small beginning of finding that immortal and immeasurable treasure, we learn that life is all of one immortal substance, indivisible, and that we are That. Being the All, there is nothing we lack or can lack. The Soul itself put forth

the phantom, poverty, to teach us what we should have learned direct from the Soul. But, as we refused the lesson of the light, and would not be drawn by the light, there was designed for us the lesson of the shadow, in order that, first terrified by it, we might become reconciled to it, and through the shadow learn to know the light.

Among the children of poverty is one, the hunger of sensations, who has also a like ministry for us. We should have known, in the long ago days of the golden ages, that, being the Soul, we are all things and possess all things; so that there is no room for hunger and thirst. But we were unwilling to taste the nectar and ambrosia, and fell into a feverish famine, hungering and thirsting for we knew not what. Thus came the misery of longing, which we seek to assuage now with this palliative, now with that. Hence come drunkenness and sensuality, which are but strivings to appease the immortal longing, which will not be cured, but by the Soul itself, the true food of the gods. The morning comes, but so dim is yet the dawning light, that it calls for some courage in us, to turn from the hunger for sensations, and to partake of the new banquet of life, feeding on it in our hearts by faith. Yet we must have that courage, for only through courageous act can pale dawn flame into the fullness of immortal day.

The hunger of sensations, like its mother, poverty, is but a lesson put forth by the soul. The lesson is bitter, but the fault of its bitterness is ours; for we should never have had to learn through the misery of longing, had we not fallen through unfaith from our rich possession in the soul. But let us take courage. Our heritage is not forfeited. It is held in trust for us; and we can claim it when we will. The only condition on which the soul is given to us, is our willingness to receive the soul. Willingness to be a disciple, is the one condition of discipleship. Such is the high generosity of the gods.

So, by small degrees at first, we shall come back to the spiritual knowledge of life. All things about us will change, slowly at first, yet surely; till we awake to a new heaven and a new earth, realising the marvelous fact that, while we thought ourselves to be dwelling amid matter, in the realm of death, we have been, since the beginning, resting in a spiritual universe, dwelling in the heart of God. We shall see around us the familiar faces of hills and valleys, trees and rocks and the waves of the sea; we shall find still about us the friends who have made so much of life's delight for

us, the enemies who have given us, in the hot pain of hatred, a sense of reality hardly given as by our friends and lovers; we shall see, too the vast crowd of indifferent persons, thronging about our enemies and friends. But all will be seen in a new light. They will become, as it were, translucent, the light of the spirit, the light of eternity, gleaming and glowing through them, friends, enemies and indifferent persons alike as the lamp gleams through the alabaster vase.

We shall become more able, in the light of the dawn, to bear our sorrow and heaviness of heart, which lingers with us, the heritage of our fancied mortality. This is a hard task; yet we shall accomplish it, and, with it, as we grow, that other task far more difficult, the patient bearing with and enduring the sorrows of others. Here is something that calls for high, immortal courage. It was this, perhaps, the quiet acceptance of the long sorrow and darkness of others, whom he would have brought to light and life, that wrung from Christ the tears of Gethsemane. This is the bitter cup, that only the great-hearted can know, only the lion-hearted and most faithful can courageously drink. Yet faith, that transforms all things, can transform this also. Is it not the Soul, the All-father, that decrees their pain and darkness, that they may be tempered and transmuted to the true essence of everlastingness? And if this be the will and purpose of the All-father, shall we not accept the Father's will?

These are difficult lessons. Let no one disguise their hardness, their pain. Nothing will help us in the learning of them but the Soul itself, that silent Might which wells up in the heart within, telling us of our immortality, whispering to us the secrets of our splendid and everlasting heritage. It may seem a dark saying, yet it is most true, that the highest and most heroic courage is needed to believe in the full splendor of the Soul. One must be great-hearted, to receive and accept the superb verity of immortal life. And there is no power, no expedient, no accomplishment, that will set us so surely on the immortal pathways as this high courage to believe in the majesty of the Soul, the faith to accept the splendid power of the Divine. That will make a new heaven and a new earth. That is the faith that removes not mountains only but this whole frame of the universe, setting it in the midst of the sea of everlasting life.

There is one condition of this new dawn; but one thing imperative to be done, if we would see the growing of the new day. For him who would go upward, it is not enough to view the mountain path as it ascends the foothills and rises to the uplands, stretching

like a thread toward the pinnacles of the hills. It is not a spectacle but a pathway. There is but one way to ascend and that is by bravely setting forth. In these days of the early springtime, in these whitening moments of dawn, we shall be blest by monitions of the Soul sounding, at first but faintly audible, within our hearts. Let us, if we value our immortality, give heed to each faint monition, obeying in reverent faith. We shall make many mistakes. We shall stumble in the gray of the twilight. But we shall learn and gain strength, and as we grow in strength we shall grow in immortality. When we feel the immortal essence pulsing within us, all things will become easy—purity and hope and high endeavor; but there is that one imperative condition, that we must do more than dream, we must act. The path is not to be looked at from afar; it is to be trodden by pilgrim feet, returning to the home of our immortality.

A PRAYER.

Let me do my work each day, and if the darkened hours of despair overcome me, may I not forget the strength that comforted me in the desolation of other times. May I still remember the bright hours that found me walking over the silent hills of my childhood, or dreaming on the margin of the quiet river, when a light glowed within me, and I promised my early God to have courage amid the tempest of the changing years.

Spare me from bitterness and from the sharp passions of unguarded moments. May I not forget that poverty and riches are of the spirit. Though the world know me not, may my thoughts and actions be such as shall keep me friendly with myself.

Lift mine eyes from the earth and let me not forget the uses of the stars. Forbid that I should judge others, lest I condemn myself. Let me not follow the clamor of the world, but walk calmly in my path. Give me a few friends who will love me for what I am, and keep ever burning before my vagrant steps the kindly light of hope. And, though age and infirmity overtake me, and I come not within sight of the castle of my dreams, teach me still to be thankful for life, and for time's olden memories that are good and sweet; and may the evening's twilight find me gentle still.

MAX EHLMANN.

THE ASCENT OF PRAYER.

IN prayer, as in all other things, there is evolution. The truth discerned by the intuitive mind of Darwin was not given by him, so far as we know, a bearing so wide or so deep. This is as well, since it is better that truth, in any of its universal aspects, should dawn *gradually* upon the mind of man. The human mind has a definite and a limited capacity of assimilation; we have had many occasions to note that there is a dyspepsia of the mind. But Darwin laid a broad and firm foundation, one easily verifiable in its broad, general sense, and readily disproved as to its suggested limitations. The point of greatest importance is that a door was opened into human thought, and that the idea of evolution became familiar to all the world.

It would appear that our modern, western civilization has to a wide extent discontinued the habit of prayer. Where the habit still continues it is automatic in a great proportion of cases, and is unaccompanied by a living faith; anyone who receives the confidences of his fellows cannot come to any other conclusion. This fact, deplorable at first sight, is not wholly so. The Spirit of Life which rules and protects the world has more ways than one of advancing, of lifting upwards; under its action, human thought often pauses—even seems to retrograde—in order to take a great leap in advance. Disbelief in the common mode of prayer as we now know it, and its discontinuance, bring about a silence and a void in our human nature and life; in this silence our consciousness, reaching upward, may embrace a wider and truer idea of the reality of that force which we name prayer. There are always religious minds, devout hearts which turn habitually and naturally in aspiration and petition towards Divinity. Minds, like water, invariably find their own level: the level once actually found it can be raised at will. Where the heart aspires, the level of thought always is raised, and this by way of the innumerable methods which the universal Spirit has forever at its command. There are those amongst us who are not evolving for the time being; those to whom eastern phraseology alludes under the striking term of “the living dead.” But with that stage of existence—the stage of human crystallization—we are not at the moment concerned. It suffices to say that there are comparatively few in our midst to whom prayer is a refuge, a refreshment and solace to the heart, a consolation to the mind, a communion with the divine Life. When sharp and sudden trial is upon us; when darkness overspreads the mind and sorrow thrones

in the heart, are there very many of us, we wonder, who find in prayer a steadfast anchor, an ark of angelic hope? Sad as the statement may appear, we do not find prayer, as a *living* evidence of faith, at the core of our civilization.

Yet the ideal of prayer, like all ideals, must be a thing of life. As an ideal it must share in the evolution of all life and consciousness. As the consciousness of man expands towards the universal Movement, and embraces ever widening areas, his ideals, always in advance of him, evolve also. We can see this plainly enough if we consider the evolution of any single ideal of the human mind. As individuals, we have no ideals which have not expanded with our mental and moral growth. This is a truth which we are far too prone to disregard. Change involves effort, pain, struggle—all the pangs of growth—and in no department of life is this struggle more complex than upon the mental plane. The reason for this is not far to seek; it resides in the tendency to crystallize, a tendency deeply seated in the human mind. Mental change costing us so much, the impulse of the natural man is to shrink from it, to resist it, while the Spirit of Life, eternally free, breaks up every mould and form, be these upon what plane they may. Through the sharp throes of this struggle every man must come, soon or late, to the perception that evolution is present in all thoughts and ideals which are living ones at all, no less than in the more objective manifestations of life; that it is present in all the embodiments of Soul. The fact of evolution really resides in the impetus and motion of the omnipresent Life, which is always advancing, and which moves all existence with it towards its transcendent goal. We regard thoughts and ideals as if they had sprung from the mind of man ready made and complete, as Minerva is fabled to have sprung—mature and fully armed—from the head of Jove. This is not so; the germ of truth is sown in the heart of man by the Spirit thereof: how the man will develop the germ, and how far, depends upon himself; upon the direction and exercise of his will. Thought is a grand power; but the Soul is greater, and is not the slave of thought save by its own choice.

In the course of a lifetime each one of us has ample occasion to observe the fallacy of the present inconsequent mode of thinking upon this subject of evolution. Not only does each generation do its part towards the evolution of any idea, but we see it in each human life as well. Take our individual lives. There are few, if any subjects upon which we feel and think in maturity as we did in childhood or in adolescent youth. Some of the intuitive ideas of our early youth may still be present; but as a rule they have been effaced by the successive waves of life; or they have stood

still and then have gone retrograde as all ideas will if they are not lived out and evolved. Where there is stagnation there will always be retrogression, decay: this is a law of life and the plane of thought offers no exception to its sway. Retrogression persisting, there is at last a breaking down, a splitting up, and death—to that form or idea. Others of our ideas have broadened, have developed. Even the intuitive beliefs which we have held to and lived by are not the same; at first a living plant in the heart of a child, they have now borne living fruit.

If we consider the ideas common to all minds, such as the ideas of crime, or of law, we find a great change. Less than a century ago a man would be hung for the theft of a sheep, imprisoned for life for an unpaid debt. Look somewhat further back, and we see people put to death for witchcraft. Our ideal of humanity and of justice has evolved with the passage of time. So with our ideals of Science; of Art; of Religion; of the air, the ether; of international relations and duties. Most of all we have expanded and deepened our ideas of man, his constitution, his history, his powers, his consciousness and his destiny. Con the lists of human invention, with their immensely extended ideas of what is possible to man; we find evolution of thought on every side. The mass-consciousness of humanity has raised its level. The level of conscience is raised as well. In individuals, as distinct from the mass, this mental evolution is of course more marked; but the consciousness of humanity is tuned an octave higher.

The ideal of prayer has passed and is still passing through a change in many minds. The habit of prayer, instilled into many of us by the authorities of our childhood, has fallen into disuse among the mass of the people; and even among many really devout and conscientious thinkers. Why is this? It may be of interest to consider the subject, even within the brief limits of this paper, tracing in part the evolution of the ideal of prayer through various phases of the human mind.

Either we never prayed at all, lacking the customary religious instruction:

Or we were taught in childhood to pray.

If we were never taught to pray, we went through life gaining such experience as we could at each step, and comprehending this experience truly or mistakenly, as the case might be. If our minds were evolving, ductile minds, we were presently struck with the fact that there *is* this ideal of prayer. We then either accepted the idea provisionally, tentatively: or we rejected the idea altogether.

Those who reject the idea pass at once into the category of minds who, as to that given ideal, are not evolving at all. They

may be evolving, probably are evolving, as to other ideals; but in respect of the ideal of prayer their evolution is checked until, at some later period of time, they are brought again to its consideration. For the immediate purposes of this paper, we have no further concern with them.

Those who accept the idea, provisionally and in sincerity, may be divided into two classes. Either they come at once to find that the effort to pray meets some need of their nature, and so feeling they grasp intuitively, finding in it an essence of spiritual happiness: or they continue to accept it provisionally, now trying to pray; now, it may be, relaxing their attempts. But whether taught to pray in childhood, or whether finding the idea later on in life; and whether continuing steadfast in prayer or dropping the custom, these minds come under the same category as to this point, viz., that the idea of prayer is now under consideration; the seed of his ideal has been sown in the nature.

For some time it exists in the background of our consciousness as a seed only; an idea, not as yet an ideal. Apart from those cases (and we shall find them in the minority) where the idea has been intuitively selected and has become an ideal, the idea of prayer remains a creation, a figment, of the mind, and that alone. But say now that we continue to pray because we were taught to pray; or because we have learned that others pray and we wish to test the value of prayer. In either case, if we continue, we form a *habit* of prayer. At first we pray because we want something which we have not got; we pray as the child petitions Santa Claus for its toys, as the savage prays to his idols for the fulfilment of his desires. And as we find that we do not receive the object of our desires—our desires masked as prayer—we gradually discontinue the useless custom; we pray mechanically, or we pray no more.

At this stage our idea of God is not high. God, the power to whom we pray, is to us something like what our French neighbors call *le bon Dieu du pot-au-feu*—a domestic deity, stirring the soup of daily life and giving out choice morsels at call; reserving, moreover, the emptiness of the iron pot for those who have not petitioned. We call upon a power which will hear (or so we think) our selfish urgency. It will lay aside its work and the claims of others to hearken to the voice of our materialistic desires; will reserve for *us* the victory; ensure to *us* the harvest, to *us* the prize. It will ignore the entreaties of other petitioners in order to grant to *us*—as we hope—the precedence for which we so ignorantly pray. To arrest our misfortune and avert our sorrow, it will suspend judgment; it will disregard merit and demerit, and will miraculously expunge the effects of the causes which we set in motion; the laws

of the universe will be cancelled at our call. To appease our dread of the wholesome discipline of life, this power will remove every opportunity of development through evolution; it will suspend the growth of our souls; check the expansion of our will-power through the exertion of our will against obstacles, by removing the obstacles; impede the unfolding of all the grand qualities of Soul—and all because we fear to trust to the wisdom and compassion of the Power Divine! Hosts of such prayers are continually arising, mutually obstructing; ephemera, many of them, of the passing hour; many rescinded by our changeful fancy before their covenanted hour has struck.

There comes a time when we see the childishness, the puerility and selfishness, the poverty of such a conception. When this moment comes, we pause; we reconsider our idea of prayer.

Pressed now by our need, we observe more closely, and it is given us to perceive that all *sincere* prayer has had an answer—but an answer addressed to the essence of our need; an answer which is not in kind, in the sense that it is not addressed to our erroneous ideas of what it is that we *really* stand in need of. For example: we have prayed for something definite which we thought would bring us happiness; the prayer was denied so far as the thing asked for went; but later on we discover that happiness is ours; the answer to our prayer was there, but it entered by another door. Or we have asked for something which was already well within our reach, would we but reach out for it—conquering some inertia of mind or soul. Or something for which we ardently implored God has been denied and later on we see that it would have brought us a deep misfortune, and have been thankful for the refusal of our petition. Then, too, there are the petitions of pure selfishness, and reason alone must agree that the world, as well as ourselves, is the better for the denial of our prayer. Worst of all it is when the object of some frantic entreaty is given to us and life becomes a torture under it. The human heart has oftentimes shuddered under what has been called “the curse of an answered prayer.” But the suffering brings a blessing if the lesson which it enfolds has been apprehended and under the thorn a fruiting blossom has appeared. This rising perception of an adjustment of our prayers makes us reconsider our position, so that this stage of our thought constitutes a step in advance. It is a difficult stage of our progress which we now enter.

In such moments of difficulty there is one thing which comes to our rescue, guiding us past a danger point. *Did we pray sincerely?* Did we really believe in the existence of such a God as we imagined to be there, hearkening to the sound of our prayer? If trust were

indeed within us, we should gradually find that there arose in our minds, quite simply and naturally, a further expansion of our idea of prayer. Did not Krishna say to Arjuna: "And even those who worship other gods with a firm faith in doing so, involuntarily worship me, too—albeit in ignorance"? Our earlier idea, gross concept that it was, was still the carrier of a germ of faith. And though this germ were but as a mustard seed we might still look to see it expanding, and in its expansion giving shelter to many a winged petition of unselfish love. All unknown to our ignorance—as Krishna implies—that living germ, a spiritual potency, was our instructor, our evolver. Our ignorant prayer was still ensouled by faith, the living faith which no husk of mould of mind can long impede. In its own good time the vital nucleus outwears the enshrouding husk and leads us one step nearer to the Soul of the world. To faith an answer must ever come. The answer is made in terms of life. Our thought is touched as by a flame, and by its glow we discover the selfishness of our prayer. We feel the Power Divine which transcends the God-idea of our earlier thought. It is a greater love which now we feel; it whispers to us of the needs of all beings and of the creaturely world. We recognise that our prayers of selfhood often sought to override and overlook their kindred necessities; to grasp some *common* issue for our very own. The clutch of that prayer has shut our hearts away from our kin and kind. With this perception a new blossom of our thought unfolds; from being an idea, the thought of prayer has become an ideal; we perceive that this ideal evolves, and we are ready to follow its leading yet further along the dim aisle of experience.

Seeing this, we have now entered upon a long train of thought which involves much and which illumines a further stretch of our path. We deepen the area of our prayer. It is now for noble things only that we pray—as we conceive nobility. Our prayer is now pure—or so we think. The truth is that we have narrowed, even while we deepened the scope of our prayer. We pray for results which are righteous—in our own sight! For conditions which have our personal esteem and approval; for the happiness of those of our kind whom we love. We still look for results: we still prescribe the answer of the all-wise Power. In asking for all these fair and good things our interior thought is really parcelling and weighing, judging and adjudging; labelling one portion of life "good," another portion "evil." Among the so-called "evil" things are pain, sorrow, misfortune, loss; the denial and strain of circumstance—in short, all the high re-adjustments worked by the Divine Law for the purification and strengthening of our souls. We deny to the Soul of the world its fundamental justice; we deny its right free-

dom to pursue its adjustments through all modes of action, all conditions. We ignore that the just and the unjust are *alike* the objects of its compassion. We ignore that the evil which we see is often working out and off, removing some hideous cancer from the human soul; teaching the human being through the purifying alembic of pain, of loss—of despair, it may be—to go on his *rightful* way and sin no more. The Universal Soul has unimaginable modes of action to the breadth and splendour of which our fixed conceptions make us blind. Seeing the scope of our isolated lives merely, we do not see; we are worse than blind. Blindness may be visited by gleams of interior insight, but to the perverted mental vision there is nor help nor cure until that offending eye—that mode of mental vision—be plucked out and cast from us. While the sense of separateness wholly directs our conceptions, what can we see of the unity, the harmony and compassion of Being?

In the presence of our sincerity there is still every hope for us. Our faith has wings to uplift, to bear us on. Once again our mind is illumined as by a flame from the central Life, and we now recognise that this which we love and approve is still our self; a wider self, truly, but not the Self Divine. And so we ask ourselves a question: for what shall we now pray, if the taint of selfhood is to be removed from our beseeching?

Let us retrace our mental steps. While we have thus been engaged in indrawing and assimilating our experience—the teaching of life which has brought us to this stage—our ideal of God has been evolving, too. We no longer look upon the Supreme Power as a *Deus ex machina*, managing the small effects of our lives by the aid of our suggestions; intervening at each stage of our progress to remove the consequences of our actions, to relieve us of the results of our deliberate choice of sin. The God of our ignorance now reveals Himself to our thought as a just and all-compassionate Power, immanent in all life, acting through divinely co-ordinated laws which make up the unity of the One Life. No caprice, no favouritism, no variableness nor shadow of turning on the part of this Power; we know that its faultless balance justly weighs. We feel intuitively that the heart of it is love. When again we see, as in a vision, the hosts of prayer, the petitions of mankind blindly seeking the hidden throne, we now have a fuller understanding of our interior thought. We know that of such prayers the large proportion strive to nullify one another, being but naive expressions of egotism, the outcries of children confused in the mists of life. Something of the pettiness of the purely human attitude flashes across our startled minds. A weariness, a disgust for this attitude comes

bitterly over us: we pause in doubt and bewilderment before this glimpse into the human heart—that heart which is still our own.

And now our thought sinks down into darkness. We are silenced, finding no egress, no light. The place in which we now stand is one in which our trust in our ideal shall be tried as by ordeal of fire. For an instant of time we have breathed a rarer air; we have caught a glimmer of the central Light. The voice of our lamentation has been extinguished by the vision of the need of the world: we realise the conflict of Desire as it unrolls itself under the eye of God.

We do not know it, but this is a place of peril, of trial; we are at the parting of the ways: much depends on what we now do.

Many minds turn back, at this point, into materialism and doubt. Others, with desperate effort, dismiss the thought, turning, self-narcotised, into some one of the many broad avenues of worldly psychic life. Some whisper to themselves: "Since no such God as I conceived can be—there is no God at all." Others there are—and these in smaller number—who substitute for their earlier idea of God an ideal of Divine Law. Under a gleam of intuitive understanding they realise that the world is governed by Law and not by chance; that ordered and successive unfolding is the Law of the Soul evolving through Nature. Such thinkers change the venue; they alter their habits of thought; they resolve to accept the Law, whatever it may appoint. They will no longer ask for especial gifts. They will not attempt to divert divine favour. Their ferocious egotism shall besiege the Infinite no more. The need for prayer has disappeared! Finding in resignation their stay; in steadfast faith their guide, they bow their hearts in silence, mute, submissive, dumb. The effacement of their human personality leaves them lost and chill in the lonely regions of thought.

But the Heart Divine is all-merciful, and cannot leave them there. Into their darkness comes a light. Into their silence steals a silent voice. A gentle touch upon their nature thrills them with hope. The shackles of the mind are undone. The mystical reconciliation is breathed into their heart; they are bidden—as by some angelic messenger, felt, though unseen by the outer vision—to pray, as the Great Christian Master prayed, that the will of the All-Father may fulfil itself upon earth as in the heaven of Divine Consciousness. Oh! wondrous moment. In it how sweet a secret is revealed! Pray, that you may approach the Divine One. Pray, that you may mingle your finite will with The Will. Pray, not that you may appropriate somewhat of life to yourself, but that you may melt your human being into Divine Being; that in an outpouring of aspiration you may be attuned to the immortal Soul. Our prayer

has become that yearning to go out to the Infinite of which every saint and martyr has sung in fullness of soul.

Not long are we able to maintain ourselves upon this height. The vortex of human life swirls up, and our footing in the divine world is lost for a time. But the wonderful moment still pulsates in the heart. It is now that the man of dauntless courage summons up his will, determined to lay hold upon the Soul. In trying to do this, he reaches the first stage of Meditation: he now attempts the prayer, potent but silent, of the great servants of The Law. By the power of his will, fired by aspiration, he unlocks, one by one, the Gates of the Soul.

So doing, he finds many petitions made vocal in his heart when he is not engaged in Meditation. But these are no longer prayers for concrete gifts, even for others. He has confided himself to the Soul and its Law, and his prayers are all forms of ardent aspiration that The Will may fulfil itself wholly, that the Soul may reveal itself further to man. By such prayers as these a door is opened into the nature, a door which gives upon the divine world. Prayer in its highest meaning is now seen as the avenue of approach to the Soul. In the unutterable longing of such prayer we lay open the field of our nature to the inrush of that Spirit whose destiny it is to fill the assembled universe with itself. Prayer, the petition, has become, first a call, then a silent contemplation of that Power which hath no name among men. We lay hold upon the Power as we realise that the Soul stands forever there, an immense, eternal reservoir of spiritual energy: we long to ally ourselves with the Power, to attract the Power as Nature attracts and holds it until its purposes are accomplished; human as we stand amidst humanity, we long to make ourselves a point of leverage for the Power, to become one of its many focii from which it radiates and distributes the energies collected there. To be, as the poet-philosopher has told us that we can be, an inlet into the whole of the ocean of Soul. By the purity of our contemplation we ally ourselves to holy messengers; to angels; to the high servitors of the Law, under whatever names they pass. The impersonal forces of our hearts, welling up from the altar of Life within us, have an invincible might derived from their pure source, that source divine and holy to which the purified heart of man serves as channel, as prophet, as priest. Holding up before the divine Consciousness all that seemeth amiss, we offer it there at the altar, asking only that the Will may be done: friend and foe, wrongs unspeakable, sorrows; errors; the lack of justice and the waning of courage and hope in our sad underworld—we offer all, all, to the Power which knoweth all: we trust it with our beloved, since the Power is Love at its zenith; we trust it with the foe, since

the Power is the very self of justice and mercy. And now we know that this Power is that which fills all creation with its song; that its Soul is expressed in the music of the spheres. Ranging over the whole field of Desire, we reject thought after thought as not expressing the fullness of our hearts, and bowed at last before that inner altar, we contemplate Divinity and are still. Our awakened soul realises—and with joy that no tongue can utter—the ascent of prayer.

II.

It will be of interest to compare the utterances of two writers of quite different types as to the reality of the value of prayer. One of these writers is a man of scientific and literary reputation; a man of open mind—Sir Oliver Lodge. The other writer is a woman—the late Madame Blavatsky. In the higher sense, both are scientists, the latter writer being wise in the science of Life, the highest science of all.

In the *Key to Theosophy* Madame Blavatsky wrote on the subject of prayer, and although her ideas have been largely misunderstood, and hence misrepresented, we can clearly see that she believed in the evolution of the ideal of prayer. She antagonised with vehement decision the ordinary methods of prayer (which she considered to be selfish), asserting that true prayer is "Will-Power," and saying that the theosophist does not believe "that prayer is a petition." "It is a mystery rather," she writes, "an occult process by which finite and conditioned thoughts and desires, unable to be assimilated by the absolute Spirit which is unconditioned, are translated into spiritual wills and the will; such transmutation—being called 'spiritual transmutations'"—. Again she writes: "Prayer, as now understood, is doubly pernicious: (a) it kills in man self-reliance. (b) It develops in him a still more ferocious selfishness and egotism than he is already endowed with by nature. I repeat that we believe in 'communion' and simultaneous action with our 'Father in secret'; and in rare moments of ecstatic bliss, in the mingling of our soul with the higher essence—." This writer, regarded as a thinker of a very high order by many theosophists, deeply esteemed the true form and exercise of prayer.

In the latest book issued by Sir Oliver Lodge, under the title *Man and the Universe*, we also find testimony as to the value of prayer. His is a truly devout mind, one open to wide conceptions of the universe and its guiding laws; laws which guide it from within, and not from without. Sir Oliver Lodge writes: "We thus return to our original thesis, that the root question or outstanding controversy between science and faith rests upon two distinct con-

ceptions of the universe: the one, that of a self-contained and self-sufficient universe, with no outlook into or links with anything beyond, uninfluenced by any life or mind except such as is connected with a visible and tangible material body; and the other conception, that of a universe lying open to all manner of spiritual influences, permeated through and through with a Divine Spirit, guided and watched by living minds, acting through the medium of law, indeed, but with intelligence and love behind the law; a universe by no means self-sufficient and self-contained, but with sensitive tendrils groping into another supersensuous order of existence, where reign laws hitherto unimagined by science, but laws as real and as mighty as those by which the material universe is governed. 'For nothing is that errs from law.' According to the one conception, faith is childish and prayer absurd;—According to the other conception, prayer may be mighty to the removal of mountains, and by faith we may feel ourselves citizens of an eternal and glorious cosmogony of mutual help and co-operation—advancing from lower stages to ever higher states of happy activity world without end—and may catch in anticipation some glimpse of that 'lone far off, divine event to which the whole creation moves.'” (*Loc. cit.*, p. 22, *et seq.*)

Lodge further says that “each one of us has a great region of the subconscious to which we do not and need not attend: only let us not deny it, let us not cut ourselves off from its sustaining power. If we have instinct for worship, for prayer, for communion with saints or with Deity, let us trust that instinct; for there lies part of the realm of religion.” (*Loc. cit.*, p. 48.)

Again he points out, that, to a certain order of synthesizing minds “prayer is quite consistent with an orderly cosmos, for it may represent a portion of the guiding and controlling will; somewhat as the desire of the inhabitants of a town for civic improvement may be a part of the agency which ultimately brings it about, no matter whether the city be representatively or autocratically governed.” (*Loc. cit.*, p. 65.)

It is quite plain to what order of universe the belief of this writer is given, for we find this fine passage at the close of one of his sections:

“Realise that you are part of a great orderly and mutually helpful cosmos—that you are not stranded or isolated in a foreign universe, but that you are part of it and closely akin to it—and your power of sympathy will be enlarged, your power of free communication will be opened, and the heartfelt aspiration and communion and petition that we call prayer will come as easily and as naturally as converse with those human friends and relations whose

visible bodily presence gladdens and enriches your present life." (*Loc. cit.*, p. 80.) What an admirable description this is of the belief of many theosophists regarding communication with those great Servants and administrators of the Law whom we call "the Masters."

Elsewhere he identifies meditation with prayer, and says also that "It may be that prayer is an instrument which can influence higher agencies, and that by its neglect we are losing the aid of an engine of help for our lives and for the lives of others." "Nor do we know how much may depend upon our own attitude and conduct:" (*Loc. cit.*, p. 51.) All this is precisely what H. P. Blavatsky taught, and a sentence of Lodge's sums up the core of her teaching in these words:

"The region of true Religion and the region of a completer Science are one." (*Loc. cit.*, 6. 51.)

III.

As we prayerfully contemplate the arena of Life, we find it holy, find it everywhere interpenetrated by the Soul. In the bright brown glances of the wayside stream; in the flicker of birds about the hedges; in the waxing stature of the trees, the increasing ripeness of the corn, the outbreathing sweetness of the flowers; in the fall of the leaf and the descent of the years; in the lifting of the clouds and the tides, we see the trend of the Power which consciously lifts Nature from within itself towards the splendid Soul. Turning manward, we see that as the currents of prayer and praise arise from the hearts of men the inner nature opens, and upon those currents the consciousness is lifted into contact with those diviner spheres from which, as from an ocean of love, the harmonies of Being ever flow. Hearing those vast harmonies we understand their voice; we realise that Spirit ensouls, as with a rosy flame, every center and nucleus of Life; that the soul consciously aspires to return, enriched and individualised in consciousness, to its eternal source. This upward Movement of all life is indeed the aspiration of the universe, and in its evolution we witness the cosmic ascent of prayer.

JASPER NIEMAND.

NATURAL, PSYCHICAL AND SPIRITUAL BODIES

PART III.

INTRODUCTION.

WE shall best understand the argument at the outset of this fourth installment of Gaudapada's wonderful poem, if we study the modern parallel to the ancient Indian controversy.

Gaudapada wishes to prove that the One Spirit alone is; that all else is unreal, that is, non-eternal. He finds two other doctrines in the field. The first of these declares "that the world is the manifestation of what has had previous being." Others, equally wise, declare "that it is the manifestation of what has had no previous being." These ancient disputants correspond exactly to two classes at the present day. The first, the scientists, affirm that the world is the manifestation of matter, and that matter has existed from eternity. The second, the theologians, declare that the world came into being through a creative act; that, up to a certain time, nothing at all existed, of all the vast panorama of the worlds; and that then the Creator, by an exercise of His Will, by the pronouncement of His Word, brought the universe into being. Gaudapada, like the good Vedantin he is, uses these two views to cancel each other, so that the true Vedantin teaching may be left alone in the field. He lets the two disputants demolish each other. The theologian retorts to the scientist that, if the latter explains the formation of the world from already existing matter, his explanation is no explanation at all; for he leaves out the question of how matter came into being. To say that it was always there, in one form or another, is to make a pretence at explaining, without really explaining. The scientist retorts that the theologian's idea is unthinkable; that nothing could come into being from nothing. Gaudapada smiles and rubs his hands, and admits most affably that the objections of both disputants are sound; and they bring us inevitably to the true Vedantin teaching, namely, that the whole manifested universe neither came into being from nothing, nor came into being from something that was there before; but that its existence is only a seeming, a mirage in the desert. There is no manifested universe at all. Nothing is, but the Eternal.

In like fashion, he undermines the view that the manifested universe is an externalization of the Eternal. This he deals with along the lines of formal Indian logic, by examining the relation of cause and effect. He comes practically to the conclusion of Kant, that causation is but a form of our thought, a colored window through which we view the colorless Real; causation, like time and space, is in our thought, not in the Thing-in-Itself, the Real. So is the sage of Königsberg anticipated by two milleniums. "Therefore there is no external manifestation either of objects or of the mind. They who see such a thing are looking at something as non-existent, as a footprint in the sky." (Verse 28.)

The argument from the unreality of dreams, in the verses which follow, is full of humor. Gaudapada almost exactly anticipates the famous Scot, who dreamed a most delicious and appetizing haggis, but unfortunately omitted to dream a spoon.

Equally humorous, equally modern, is the elephant of the fortieth verse. We may imagine Gaudapada chuckling to think of one of his opponents being chased by an imaginary elephant, conjured up by hypnotic suggestion. The simile of the fire-brand whirled in the air, which is introduced at the forty-seventh verse, is peculiarly charming. I suppose we have all, in the days of happy childhood, taken a stick, burned its end to a red ember, and then whirled it in the dark, weaving lovely circles of fire through the blackness, or tracing red zig-zags and ovals against the night. This simile has, indeed, given this section of the poem its title: The Quenching of the Fire-brand; and what follows is so lucid as to need no comment or explanation.

GAUDAPADA'S POEM.

IV.

"QUENCHING OF THE FIRE-BRAND."

He who, by wisdom clear and wide as the ether, illumining through union with what is known, has realised that all visible qualities are but as the visible sky which rests in the ether: him I praise, of men most excellent.

He who teaches the Union which is limitless, bringing happiness to all beings, beings free from dissonance or discord; to him in reverence I bow.

There are some who affirm the world is the manifestation of what has had previous being; others, as wise, declare it the manifestation of what has had no previous being. Thus they contradict each other.

But what has previous being is already manifested, object these

latter. What has had no previous being can never be manifested, object the former. Thus they come to the teaching of the Advaita, which declares that manifestation is unreal.

For we gladly accept the objections to the reality of manifestation, which they thus raise. Know therefore we have no dispute with these. (5)

There are those who wish to maintain the real manifestation of that Real, which is ever unmanifest. But how can the unmanifest, immortal Real come to mortality?

The immortal becomes not mortal, nor can the mortal become immortal. For it is impossible that anything can become the opposite of its own nature.

He who says that what is by nature immortal may become mortal—how can he maintain that what enters into manifestation nevertheless remains immortal?

The nature of a thing is that which is complete in itself, that which is its very essence, that which is innate, that which is not added to it from without, that which does not lose its inherent character.

All real beings are of their own nature free from old age and death. If they accept the thought of old age and death, they fall away from their own nature. (10)

He who admits that the cause and the effect of life are one, believes the process of causing is the origin of manifestation. But how can the unmanifest pass into manifestation? Or how can the Eternal One be divided?

If it be meant that the effect is not of other nature than the cause, and if the cause be unmanifest, then how can the cause of an effect, which is manifest, be itself changeless?

If one assert that an effect comes into being from a cause which is unmanifested, then there is no example of this. Or if it be said that the effect springs from a cause already manifest, and this from another, then no solution is reached.

There are those who declare the result is the source of the cause, and the cause again the source of the result. How can such maintain that either cause or result is sourceless?

When they say the result is the source of the cause, and the cause again the source of the result, they assert a progression like the birth of the father from the son. (15)

You must determine the order of cause and result in manifestation. Two things which appear simultaneously cannot be related causally, like the two horns of an ox.

A cause which has its source in a result can have no perfect being. How can a cause which is imperfect accomplish a result?

If the completeness of the cause depend on the result, and the completeness of the result on the cause, which of the two comes into being before the other? For the completion of the one depends on the other.

This dilemma rests either on inability to explain, or incomplete knowledge, or the fact that the order of succession breaks down. In each case, these learned views only serve to illumine more brightly the teaching that manifestation has no real existence.

There is the illustration of the tree produced from the seed. But this is of the same nature, as the relation of cause and effect. Therefore it is not fitting to use in explanation a case of the same nature as the thing to be explained. (20)

Inability to determine which is first and which is last likewise strengthens the teaching that manifestation is unreal. For how could it be said of anything which comes into being, that its antecedent is unknowable?

We teach that no reality comes into manifestation either from itself or from any other thing. Whether it be being or non-being or both, no reality ever comes into manifestation.

The cause of the beginningless cannot come into manifestation, nor can the result come into manifestation of itself. For if anything is beginningless, then it never begins at all.

But this objection is raised: There must be a cause which gives birth to perceptions; otherwise both would cease to exist. And also from the existence of pain, the reality of external causes must be accepted.

We admit that reason demands that a cause be assigned for perception. But the nature of things equally demands that this cause shall be itself causeless. (25)

The imagination does not come into contact with objects, nor is there a mirroring of objects in the imagination. For the object has no permanent reality, nor does the mirrored image exist apart from the object.

The imagination never touches any real object whether in past, present or future. And how could there be a mistaken impression of something that has no existence?

Therefore there is no external manifestation either of objects or of the mind. They who see such a thing are looking at something as non-existent as a footprint in the sky.

People say that the unmanifested comes into outward manifestation. But its very nature is to be unmanifested. And nothing can possibly depart from its own nature.

And it is illogical to say that the circle of birth and rebirth is beginningless, and at the same time to say that it is non-eternal.

And likewise, unless Liberation be beginningless, it cannot be eternal. (30)

That which has no being in the past, and has no being in the future, must also have no being in the present. Things which seem not to be illusions are nevertheless of like nature with illusions.

Though they seem to be means to an end, yet this seeming ceases in sleep. Therefore, as they have beginning and end, they cannot have real being.

All things beheld in dream are but mirages, for they have no existence outside the body. For how could there be a beholding of real objects in so circumscribed a space?

Nor can it be that the dreamer beholds distant things by going to them, for no time is taken in going. Nor does the dreamer find himself at the distant place when he awakes.

Though he has talked with friends in dream, he does not find them there when he awakes. Even if he has laid hold of anything he does not find it in his hand when he wakes. (35)

The body in which we take part in dreams is unreal, since there is still the physical body apart from it. And as is the dream body, so are all things; they are all but figments of the imagination.

Because dreams are so like waking experiences, the latter must be their cause. Therefore, it may be said, waking experiences must be real.

But we say that nothing is ever really manifested outwardly, since outward manifestation has no real existence. And further the unreal is never caused by the real.

Having experienced the unreal in waking consciousness, he who is saturated with it sees it again in dream. And having experienced the unreal in dream, the man wakes up, and sees it no longer.

It cannot be that both the unreal and the real have their cause in the unreal. Even the real cannot be said to have the real as its cause; how then could this be said of the unreal? (40)

Just as in waking, through imaginative illusion one can seem to touch things not to be thought of as real; so in dream, through imaginative illusion, one sees things possible only in dream.

But the teaching that manifestation is a reality is put forward by the sages, only for the sake of those who are afraid of the thought that manifestation is no reality, those who rest their belief on common experience and on the adequacy of ritual acts.

Those who are afraid of the thought that manifestation is no reality, and who rely on experience, suffer no great detriment thereby, though they do fall short of truth.

As an elephant which is a mere hypnotic illusion may be the

basis of experience and the cause of action, in just the same way what we call objectivity is the basis of experience and action.

The One, which is ever at peace, which is pure Consciousness, without manifestation, motion or material existence, appears to have manifestation, appears to be in motion, appears to be material. (45)

Thus, verily, neither is imagination outwardly manifested, nor are objects outwardly manifested; thus, verily, the wise fall not into these inverted illusions.

Just as a fire-brand whirled in the air appears to make a straight or crooked line of light, so Consciousness set in motion gives the appearance of perceiver and perceived, subject and object.

Just as the fire-brand does not really take these shapes, but remains apart from this illusion and unchanged by it; so, verily, does Consciousness remain apart from the illusion of manifestation, and unchanged by it.

When the fire-brand is whirled about, the appearances it gives rise to, do not come from any external source; nor do they go anywhere else when it ceases to be whirled, nor do they withdraw into the fire-brand.

They do not go out of the fire-brand, because they have no substantial existence; just the same is true of Consciousness, for the illusion of appearance is common to both of them. (50)

When Consciousness is in motion, the appearances in it do not come from any external source; nor, when its motion ceases, do they go to any other place; nor do they withdraw again into Consciousness.

They do not go out of Consciousness, because they have no substantial existence; they are always incapable of being accounted for by thought, because they are outside of causality.

Substance is the cause of substance; what is other than substance is the cause of what is other than substance. But conscious selves are neither substance nor other than substance.

In the same way, conscious selves are not the effect of imagination, nor is imagination the effect of conscious selves. Thus the wise take refuge in the truth that there is no real manifestation of cause and effect.

So long as there is a belief in cause and effect, so long will there be the seeming operation of cause and effect. But when the belief in cause and effect fades, then also will the seeming operation of cause and effect pass away. (55)

So long as there is a belief in cause and effect, so long will the sequence of birth and rebirth continue; but when the belief

in cause and effect fades away, the sequence of birth and rebirth will cease.

Through the enveloping power of delusion all manifestation comes into being, therefore it is not eternal. As everything is in reality not manifested, through its non-separation from the Real, therefore there is no destruction of anything.

The conscious selves that seem to come into manifestation, do not really come into manifestation. It is through Glamor that they seem to come into manifestation. And Glamor has no real being.

Just as from a seed which is the result of Glamor, a sprout which is the result of Glamor comes forth, and is neither eternal, nor subject to destruction, so is the manifestation of conscious selves.

Since conscious selves do not in reality come into manifestation, they cannot be said either to be eternal as such, or not to be eternal. Where no distinctions of quality exist, there can be no distinguishing description (60)

Just as in dream the imagination plays at subject and object, through the power of Glamor; in just the same way, in waking, the imagination plays at subject and object, through the power of Glamor.

And as there is no doubt at all that the imagination, which seems thus divided in dream, is not divided, so there is no doubt at all that the imagination, which seems to be dual in waking, is not really divided.

The beholder of a dream, moving about in dream in all the ten directions of space, sees all kinds of living things standing there, whether egg-born or sweat-born, or whatever they be.

But they exist only in the imagination of the beholder of the dream, and have no existence separate from him; in just the same way the imagination of the beholder of the dream has no existence apart from him.

So one who is awake moves through the ten directions of the waking world, and beholds all kinds of living things, whether egg-born or sweat-born. (65)

But these beings are visible only to the waking consciousness, and have no existence apart from it. In just the same way, the imagination of waking consciousness has no separate existence.

The two depend for their seeming existence on their mutual interaction; both are beyond the range of every instrument of mental analysis, for such instrument exists only in them.

Just as the being seen in dream appears to pass through birth and death, so all these beings in the world neither are nor are they not.

Just as the being produced by Glamor seems to pass through birth and death, so all these beings in the world neither are nor are they not.

Just as the being created by suggestion seems to pass through birth and death, so all these beings in the world neither are nor are they not. (70)

No being is really born; there is no real manifestation for him. This is the supreme truth, which teaches that naught is really manifested.

This dual world of perceiver and perceived comes into being through the motion of the imagination. Therefore the imagination is declared to be unrelated to objects, everlasting, unattached.

The being that is built up by the enveloping power of illusion has no transcendental reality. So things held to exist by the delusions of other schools of thought, have no transcendental reality.

The Real is spoken of as unmanifest, through the illusion of defective thought, but it cannot in the transcendental sense even be said to be unmanifest. It is said to be unmanifest, only with reference to other defective schools of thought, which speak of it as manifest. (74)

Firm faith persists only in that which does not come into being; in that, there is no duality. He who understands that duality is unreal, is beyond causation, and does not fall into birth.

Where the imagination accepts no causes, whether good, bad or middling, then it falls not into birth; for without a cause, how can there be an effect?

The non-manifestation of the imagination, which is thus without a cause, is non-dual and unconditioned; the same is true of everything unborn, for it is but the work of the imagination.

Awaking to the truth that causation is not a final reality, and finding no external, separate cause for manifested existence, one reaches the heart's desire, the resting-place that is free from fear and beyond sorrow.

Belief that unreal things are real attaches us to unreal things. But when we wake up to the fact that outer things are unreal, we become free from attachment to them.

Poise unshakable is his, who is free from the illusion of outward reality and manifestation. This is the aim of the awakened; this is the unconditioned, the unborn, the One. (80)

The Self is unborn, free from drowsiness and dreams, self-illuminated; by the very nature of its being, it is ever self-illuminated.

Through our grasping after one outer object after another, the joy of the Self is perpetually concealed, and suffering fills our field of view. But the Lord, the real Self is there, awaiting us.

The childish minded fails to find the Self, because he is wrapped up in arguments as to whether it is or is not, is and is not, or exists not at all; arguments drawn from the ideas of things moving or stable or both, or non-being.

The Self is perpetually being concealed by predicating of it one of these four alternatives. He is the perfect Seer, who beholds the Self as untouched by these.

When he has attained complete omniscience, the secondless resting-place of the Eternal, which is without beginning, middle or end, what remains for him to long for? (85)

This is the highest virtue of the twice-born, this is called the true peace, this is the true control which springs from the conquest of the lower nature; he who knows this, shall enter into peace.

The sense of the world as dual, made up of outer things and inner emotions, is a worldly perception. The sense of the world as single, made up of emotions without outer things, is equally worldly.

That which is beyond outer things and emotions is declared to be above worldly experience; it is proclaimed by the wise to be at once wisdom, and the goal of wisdom and knowledge.

When the knowledge of the three worlds is grasped, when they are known in ascending degrees, then the sage enters into perfect knowledge of all things.

The first steps of knowledge, concerning what is to be abandoned, what is to be known, what is to be acquired, what is to be ripened, are all but figurative expressions, except that which concerns what is to be known. (90)

All different forms and characters should be known as by nature like the ether, beginningless. Their difference is not real at any time, in any place.

All forms and characters but dwell in thought, through their very nature; from the beginning, they are clearly defined. He who accepts this truth, builds for immortality.

By their very nature, all forms and characters are devoid of true outward existence, they are essentially unreal, they have no being apart from the Self, the unborn, which brings us light.

Those who dwell in the thought of separateness do not reach the Light. Those who are in bondage to separateness, who declare that objects really exist apart from the Self, are pitiful. (94)

But those who will dwell firm-set in the unborn One, they indeed are wise in this world; but this wisdom the world cannot reach.

True wisdom is that which, being unmanifest, does not hold itself to be dependent on forms and characters which have no real

being. Wisdom, thus independent, is declared to be free from attachment.

There can be no true detachment for the unwise in whom dwells even an atom of the sense of separateness; is not this the very thing that conceals the Real?

Since all forms and characters are of their very nature one with the stainless Self, they have never been the cause of the Self's concealment. From the beginning they are nothing but thought; they can be known, only as being nothing but thought.

The wisdom of him who has reached illumination, who is full of fervor, does not concern itself with characters and forms; for him, forms and characters have no true reality. This is not the same as saying that the subjective is real.

Having thus realized the One, which is hard to behold, which dwells in the deeps, which is ever equal, which is full of light, that resting-place where there is no separateness: let us bow down to that One, in the measure of our enlightenment. (100)

CHARLES JOHNSTON.

THE END.

To the inward vision it is light, to the heart it is love, to the spirit it is an awakening, and to all the being it is an inward glow and peace that passeth understanding.

The world needs this light. All those through whom it may shine should open the windows of their souls and let it pour in. He who refuses is not a friend to his God, to his fellow man or to himself.

The greatest words that Paul ever spoke were uttered near the end of his life when he said: "I have not disobeyed the heavenly vision." Those who have the heavenly vision must not disobey it. Though it leads them through ridicule, hardship, incessant toil, poverty and even martyrdom, they must follow the voice. If they thrill with the message they must speak.

The personality is nothing. If it gives the highest message it is only an instrument through which God pours a little of His truth. However imperfect the instrument may be, yet it has done its part if it utters the highest that is in it. The divine harmony is infinite. Enough for one man if he can catch even a single strain of that ineffable music and let it sound through him to the world.

STERLING GAZETTE.

NIETZSCHE AND MADAME BLAVATSKY:

THEIR DOCTRINES STATED AND COMPARED.

INTRODUCTION.

TO be unable nowadays to discuss both Nietzsche and Madame Blavatsky is to confess oneself lacking in "culture"—a confession which few of us have the courage to make. Just as Strauss and Rodin dominate in the domain of art, the ideas of Nietzsche and of Madame Blavatsky, as subjects of discussion, are more popular for the moment than those of any other writers on philosophy.

And while all fashions are significant, fashions in philosophy reveal the thoughts and aspirations of humanity in plain words. If only for that reason, no one who either works among men or who finds entertainment in observing them, can afford to ignore the widely different tendencies which these two writers represent.

Volumes have been written about both of them, but nothing has been attempted by way of comparison. It will be seen, I trust, that they serve one another admirably as contrasts.

Studying them, as we might look at magnifying mirrors reflecting the minds of men, it is of much more importance to grasp the purport of their writings than to judge, no matter how correctly, their personal characters. From that point of view, whether Nietzsche was a genius, a lunatic, a poseur, or an atheistic Savonarola; whether Madame Blavatsky was a divinely inspired messenger, a charlatan, or an anti-Christ, is of minor interest. We shall see, too, that neither of them said "Believe because I tell you it is true;" but that, on the contrary, both of them insisted that they, personally, were merely sign-posts by the way, and that their disciples must think for themselves and work out their own salvation accordingly.

Nevertheless, as their origin and personal history throw some light upon their teachings, it will be best in each case to speak briefly of their lives before considering the ideas with which their names are associated.

PART I.

Friedrick Nietzsche (pronounced Neet-chă) was born in Prussia on the 15th of October, 1844. His origin and personal history throw

much light upon his teachings. He was the son of a Lutheran minister; both his grandparents had been ministers, and his great-grandfather on his mother's side had also been a minister.

Although born in Germany, he always laid stress on the fact that he was not a German, but a Pole; and as a boy he took pleasure and pride in tracing his ancestry—whether correctly or not is unknown—to a family of Polish nobles named Niëtzky. "A Count Niëtzky must not lie," he used to say, while quite a child, to his sister.

Educated for the ministry, he found, even as a student, that it would be impossible for him to accept Christianity literally. Its principal doctrines, he wrote, "are symbols, just as the very highest truths must always be the symbols of truths still higher."* And he soon reached a point at which he ceased to find in Christianity even the symbols of truth. It seemed to him that he had to choose between "God" and "Truth," and he determined to follow the latter no matter where it might lead him. He wished to be sincere with himself always and at any cost. The question of questions for him then became: What is for man generally, what, above all, for me, is the meaning of life, *seeing that God does not exist?* There is no question but that he threw his whole being into the solution of this problem.

As he had a great gift for improvisation, he thought at one time of becoming a musician and of earning his living by that means. This idea he was obliged to give up. He then decided to study Philology, which he did, first at Bonn, and then at Leipzig. In 1869 he was appointed a professor at the University of Basle. He remained there for ten years, and if it had not been for the Franco-Prussian War of 1870, he might have retained his professorship for the rest of his life. As it was, shortly after the outbreak of hostilities, he volunteered to serve as a member of the Red Cross. His constitution broke down under the strain. This ruined his health permanently, and in 1879, having already achieved considerable success as an author, he resigned his professorship in order to devote the whole of his remaining strength to literature.

The only outer event in his life which calls for notice during his residence at Basle, was his intimacy with Richard Wagner, with whom he often stayed at Bayreuth. All that need here be said under that head is that after writing in 1876, *Richard Wagner in Bayreuth*, a work in which he held up the great composer as the master of music and as a genius who was guiding the younger generation away from modern philistinism, he afterwards changed his opinion, declaring that the most important event of his life had been a "cure," and that Wagner had been his illness. Wagner was a magical "comedian," the adequate artistic expression of our era of decadence.

* *Das Leben Nietzsches*, Frau Förster-Nietzsche; i, 321.

But the dominant influence in Nietzsche's life was the physical suffering which he endured. For years the most terrible headaches, and at last, in the spring of 1889, madness. Eleven years later, on August 25, 1900, he died. His philosophy grew out of his suffering. At first a pessimist, to whom history seemed "brutal and devoid of sense;" unable to believe in a future state or to find any reason for his suffering, he came to the conclusion later that pessimism itself is a symptom of some physiological disorder, and as he willed to grow well, he willed to become an optimist: "the instinct of self-preservation forbade him to remain discouraged," he said.*

He determined, therefore, in spite of, if not because of, his suffering, to find joy in the present. His inspiration for this he found in ancient Greece—in its tragic or dionysian spirit, which is best expressed, he considered, in the dramas of Æschylus, and in the philosophy of Heraclitus. These were the people, he declared, who said "Yes" to life; who were the true aristocrats; who were full of vital power, who saw that instinct was superior to reason, and by whom "Pain itself was felt as a stimulant."† Consequently, instead of preaching detachment from life and aspiration for Nirvana as Schopenhauer had done (and to a certain extent and up to a certain point in his career he had followed Schopenhauer), Nietzsche came to regard as "good," everything which strengthened in man the will to live, everything which could give to existence some further purpose and interest.

But this was only the first step in his intellectual development, and he took many intermediate steps before he formulated the system, if it can be called a system, which is commonly called Nietzscheism. He himself would have repudiated the idea of having introduced anything resembling a body of doctrines. For him the philosopher was everything; the philosophy very little. So he made his own personality the center of his philosophy and passed his life in trying to "find himself," and in communicating to the world the result of his investigations.

This he did fragmentarily, often in the form of aphorisms, and always "impressionally"—his enemies say, incoherently. But he took infinite pains to present his ideas in the most seductive form he could command: in the form of prose-poetry, rather than of logic, which he despised; in the form most likely to appeal to the "Self" of man (and we shall see later what he meant by Self). Musician as he was, his style is essentially lyrical, passionate, symbolical; so perfect, in the opinion of his admirers, that he must be counted the greatest master of prose that Germany has ever produced. It is difficult to imagine Spencer's *Data of Ethics*, or Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*, set to music; but

* Frau Förster-Nietzsche, II, 1, p. 338.

† *Götzen-Dämmerung* ("Was ich den Alten verdanke"); Nietzsche's Werke (Erste Abtheilung; C. G. Naumann, Leipzig, 1899); vol. viii, p. 173. Socrates he detested as a plebeian, and as the incarnation of reason.

Nietzsche's *Zarathustra*, his most important work, was chosen by Richard Strauss as the subject of his best-known symphony.

* * * * *

If it can be said that Nietzsche's philosophy—or rather, his theory of life—has a basis in reason, this must be found, not in the "Eternal Return" (an idea that occurred to him in 1881 only, and of which we will speak later), but in his conception of moral "values." A "Table of Values," he says, is set up in each age and by each civilization. In our age, for instance, truth is considered superior to error, compassion to cruelty. He regards such values as man-made and arbitrary. Rejecting the existence of God, he rejects the existence of "things in themselves." Why truth rather than error? May not error be of greater use than truth? May not evil be of greater value than good? He decides that the only reality we can know is the world of our desires and instincts. There is no soul, or rather, the body is the soul.

"Behind thy thoughts and feelings, my brother, there stands a mighty master, an unknown Guide—he is named Self. In thy body he dwells; he is thy body."*

All our acts, thoughts, "reasons," and wishes, then, are governed by our body and its instincts (the "Self"); and these instincts, in their turn, are controlled by a primordial and fundamental instinct which he calls the "Will for Power" (*Der Wille zur Macht*).

This Will for Power, being the mainspring of life, anything which strengthens and satisfies it is "good;" anything which weakens it or which defeats its ends is "bad." What life in itself is worth, no one can judge; pessimism and optimism are alike futile; but life *is*, and so long as there is life one should will it to be as exuberant, as tropical, as intense as possible. One should say "Yes" to everything that will increase the vitality of the man-plant: to error and to illusion as much as to anything else, even to what are called evil and sin if these too are likely to produce the desired effect. On the other hand, one should say "No" to everything that tends to diminish power, no matter whether one has to turn one's back on every ideal that the world has known.

With that as his foundation, it is not surprising that Nietzsche found himself in violent disagreement with the Table of Values accepted, at least theoretically, by the modern world. The origin of this "Table" he explains as follows:

Speaking generally, the world has known two types of morality: the morality of the aristocrat, the master, and the morality of slaves. Since the dawn of history, one or another warlike race has conquered some weaker race, and has set up its own aristocratic Table of Values.

* Werke, VI, 47.

To be self-reliant, to know how to rule and how to rule oneself; to be refined, courteous to his equals, elegant, to love "good form;" to be proud, stern, and yet joyous; to be forceful and audacious, and to hate and despise fear, flattery, humility, lying, and all that he considered vulgar and unclean; these things were essential. Above all, the aristocrat felt that he owed duties to his peers only, and that to the stranger and the slave he could behave exactly as he liked.

Naturally the Table of Values erected by the race that had been conquered, by the slaves, was very different. For them, "evil" was all that was violent and that inspired fear; while "good" included most of the qualities which the aristocrat despised, but which made life more bearable to the slave; such as pity, gentleness, patience, humility, and industry.

How is it, Nietzsche asked, that this latter code has supplanted in Europe the Table of Values of the aristocrat? And he answered that it was the work of the Jews and of their abortion—Christianity. The Jews, the ten-times conquered, and formerly the despised among men, had inaugurated the "revolt of the slaves," and had imposed upon the world the hateful doctrine that it is the unfortunate, the down-trodden, the poor, the feeble, the sick, even the ugly and the de-vitalized, who are the best beloved of God.

From that point Nietzsche's doctrine, in a negative sense, can be left very largely to the imagination.

The tendency of modern Europe he described as follows:

"Behold," teaches Zarathustra, his creation, his type of the Superman, "behold, I show you the *last man*.

"'What is love? What is creation? What is desire? What is a star? (*Was ist Stern?*)'—Thus asks the last man, and blinks.

"Earth has then become small, and on her hops the last man who makes everything around him small. His race is ineradicable, like an earth-flea; the last man lives the longest.

"'We have discovered happiness,' say the last men, and blink. They have abandoned the regions where it was hard to live: for they need warmth. They love their neighbor, besides, and rub themselves against him: for they need warmth.

"To become ill, and to be distrustful, is for them a sin: they move with precaution. A fool, he who still stumbles over stones or over people.

"A little poison from time to time: that gives pleasant dreams. And much poison at the last, for a pleasant death.

"They still work, because work is an entertainment. But they take care that the entertainment is not an effort.

"They no longer become either poor or rich: both are too trouble-

some. Who would still wish to command? And who to obey? Both are too troublesome.

"No shepherd and one flock! Each man wishes the same thing. All are equal: who feels otherwise, voluntarily enters a madhouse.

"Of old, the whole world was crazy,' say the Most Superior, and blink.

"One is sagacious, and knows all that has happened: so one has no Aim to scoff at. One still disputes, but one is quickly reconciled—otherwise it spoils the stomach.

"One has one's little Fancy (*Lüstchen*) for the day, and one's little Fancy for the night: but one respects Health.

"We have discovered Happiness,' say the last men, and blink." *

Every philosophy which teaches that peace is better than war; every morality which defines happiness negatively; every system of metaphysics which sees in a state of equilibrium, of repose, the final attainment of evolution; every esthetic or religious aspiration towards a better world, a "beyond," is fundamentally a symptom of this "blinking" degeneracy.

Naturally, Christianity and everything that savours of asceticism, he attacks with fury, almost exhausting his magnificent vocabulary in anathematizing priestcraft, and declaring that the very spirit of Christianity, apart from its dogmas, has polluted and debased the intellectual and moral atmosphere of Europe.

"The sense of sin," one of the chief supports of Christianity, is entirely self-induced, he says. It arises in large measure from what is known as a bad conscience; but a bad conscience he accounts for as follows:

When a race is conquered, the individuals comprising it can no longer give free play to their instincts: prudence obliges them to suppress these for fear of offending the conqueror. But instincts are a force which must have an outlet, if not exterior, then interior. The exterior channel being cut off, a kind of interior fermentation takes place, and it is this that men call a "bad conscience."

An aphorism of his in regard to Theosophy, of which the following is a free translation, will throw some further light on the subject.

"The result of Theosophy. One is most dishonest against one's God: one is not allowed to sin!" †

Impersonality he abhors.

That man should surrender his personal desires and his egoism, he repudiates indignantly. Man should use all his instincts and desires, "bad" as well as "good," in his search for experience. He should be careful, however, that his desires do not use him.

* Also *Sprach Zarathustra*, V. vi, pp. 19-20.

† "Aus der Theosophie. Man ist am unehrlichsten gegen seinen Gott: er darf nicht sündigen!" (*Sprüche und Zwischenspiele*, vol. vii, p. 95).

Democracy, which aims to establish a condition of things in which wealth and poverty, "masters" and "slaves," will alike be abolished; which talks of "universal brotherhood" and of peace, and believes that the individual can and should find his happiness in the happiness of society as a whole—he attacked as unsparingly as he attacked Christianity. The natural inequality of men is one of the fundamental ideas of his philosophy. "Slavery," he says, "is one of the essential conditions of a high culture." * War he regards as one of the most important means of progress. It brings to light the strength and the weakness of men. Zarathustra declares:

"Ye say, the good cause justifies even war? I say to you: it is the good war that justifies every cause.†

He carried his individualism so far that even in Germany, where, since Hegel, individuals have been looked upon as existing chiefly for the benefit of the State, he questioned the utility of the State as an aid to Culture.

Scientists he condemned generally as being made of much the same stuff as ascetics. They are "presumptuous pygmies;" the best of them only mirrors—instruments instead of wills, "ignoring all joys except those of knowing and reflecting," so hopelessly impersonal as to be capable of saying with Leibnitz, "I despise hardly anything."‡

Sceptics of every variety he almost pitied. They are even more impotent than scientists, from the creature who is sceptical in order to appear dilettante and distinguished, to the poor wretch who, having tried to solve the riddle of the universe, has given up the problem in weariness and despair, and who has become a sceptic because he has not the energy to be anything else.

Philosophers he upbraided for pretending to present their systems as purely logical, while really all that they say is a plea in support of their personal prejudices.

For women who are, in his opinion, truly feminine, he shows tenderness and respect. But he believes that the inequality of the sexes is a necessary law.

"The happiness of man," says Zarathustra, "is named: I desire. The happiness of woman: he desires."|| The highest function of women is to bring beautiful children into the world. Anything which interferes with this, he deplores. But he does not deplore, he execrates the notion that women should be more than mothers, sweethearts, or wives. The "emancipated" woman, who competes with man in the sphere of literature, science or commerce, he simply lacerates.

* W., IX, p. 98.

† W., V, 67.

‡ W., VII, 150-155; *Jenseits von Gut und Böse*.

§ W., VI, 97.

But now for the positive side of his teaching—and we shall see that this, too, is very largely made up of negatives. First in importance, philosophically, comes the idea of the "Eternal Return." To state this in the fewest possible words, his argument is that the sum of the forces which constitute the universe is constant and limited. Time on the other hand is infinite. It follows that sooner or later any given combination of the sum of forces must, by reason of the natural and unintelligent play of possibilities, be reproduced, and that, no matter what length of time may elapse between such reproductions of combinations, the process must have been repeated indefinitely in the past, and will be repeated for ever in the future: exactly the same combinations.* So every act, thought, and emotion will re-live in us an infinite number of times. The world, therefore, means nothing. It is the product of blind chance. Evolution leads no where, and progress is a treadmill revolving eternally on the same center, marking the same circle.

Nietzsche professed to hold logic so cheaply, that it is difficult to say what if any connection this idea of the "Eternal Return" had with his doctrine of the *Über-Mensch*, or Super-man. Yet the one to some extent explains the other; for, granting that life has no meaning, it is arguable that it is man's business to give it a meaning. In any case, it is the primary function of the Super-man to create new "values" in life.

This ideal, the Super-man, personified by Nietzsche as Zarathustra in *Also Sprach Zarathustra* (the best known of his works, and to some extent an epitome of his earlier writings), is put forward as the type of what the elect of mankind should become. Zarathustra, having attained this condition, collects around him in his cavern a number of pessimists, representing the elect, whom he instructs, and whom he cures of their pessimism.

It is for the elect only that the morality of the Super-man is intended. Nietzsche insists strongly that the ordinary man ought to live in obedience and faith. His Utopia—the ideal State of the future as he conceived it—is to be an aristocracy, divided into castes, each with well defined duties. The inferior caste is to consist of laborers. Agriculture, commerce, industry, even science and art will need them—men who follow, who are content to copy, to obey. The members of this lower caste will be happier, in a tranquil kind of way, than their superiors, because they will have no responsibilities. "For you, belief and slavery," says Zarathustra. Above them will be the caste of overseers, warriors, and guardians of the law; at their head, a king. But the highest caste, the real rulers, will be that of the Sages, of the "creators of values," who will play the same rôle on earth as "the God of the Christians" is supposed to play in the universe. Very few are

* W., XII, 122.

those who are fit to enter this highest caste. Zarathustra demands much before he will accept any one as a disciple.

"Art thou," he asks, "a new force and a new law? An original movement? A wheel which turns of itself? Canst thou likewise compel the stars to revolve around thee?"

"Alas! There is so much hankering for the High! There are so many spasms of the ambitious! Show me that thou art not one of the hankers, of the ambitious!"

"Alas! There are so many great thoughts which have no more effect than a bellows: they puff up and make more empty!"

"Free, thou callest thyself? It is thy predominant thought that I wish to hear, and not that thou hast escaped from a yoke."

"Art thou such as needed to escape from a yoke? There are those who cast off their last value when they cast off their servitude."*

It is for the benefit of the few only, then, that he elaborates the doctrine of life as "that which must always surpass itself."†

"I teach you concerning the Super-man," says Zarathustra to the people assembled. "Man is something that ought to be surpassed. What have you done to surpass him?"‡

Man is not an end, but a bridge between the animal kingdom and the Super-man. He may attain the condition of Super-man by a process of "self-upraising" (*Selbstaufhebung*);|| by an intensity of suffering so great that it leads at last to optimism. The first step is that which his disciples had already taken: intense disgust of themselves, leading them to pessimism or asceticism. Zarathustra tells them that they have not suffered enough. "For ye suffer on account of what ye are; ye have not yet suffered on account of what Man is."§ Only by attaining this supreme degree of pain and disgust can they develop sufficient energy to cross the last gulf which separates them from the state of Super-man.

But suffering alone is not enough. They must renounce the table of moral values which the world now recognizes as authoritative; they must renounce the ideal which, whether it be called Christian, democratic or ascetic, is at present accepted nominally or actually in civilized countries; and they must return to the table of values of conquering races, of the masters who create values for themselves instead of accepting those of other people. Realizing that nothing in nature has any value in itself; that there is no such thing as an ideal in itself; they must create their *own* truth, their *own* morality, regardless of good and evil, of truth and of error—deliberately "willing illusion," creating

* W., VI, 91, 92.

† W., VI, 167.

‡ W., VI, 13 (".....das überwunden werden soll").

§ "Selbstaufhebung" may mean either "self-upraising," or "self-suspension" and "self-suppression." It is probable that Nietzsche used the word with its dual meaning in view.

|| W., VI, 421 ("Ihr leidet an euch, ihr littet noch nicht am Menschen").

lies, if by doing so they can increase the intensity of life, and thus assist the development of their type.

Daring experimenters, continually searching for new forms of existence and experience, they must be prepared to risk, without trembling, not only their own happiness and life, but the lives and happiness of all those inferior creatures whom they drag after them. It is, indeed, not happiness which they seek, but the *emotion of the game*. They know that pleasure and pain are opposites which always co-exist, and that he who would experience the great joys must also endure the great sorrows. But this fact they welcome, for they wish life to be as intense, as strenuous as possible, and the wider the oscillation of emotion, the more tremendous their sense of power. They must go further even than saying "Yes" to all that life brings.

"The will is a creator," says Zarathustra to his disciples. "Every 'it was' is a fragment, an enigma, a horrid accident—until the creative Will says to it: 'But I wished it thus!' Until the creative Will says to it: 'But I wish it thus! Thus I would have it!'"*

And, having said this, the Super-man must adopt an attitude of mind in regard to results which is curiously akin to that "abandonment of the fruits of action" inculcated by Krishna in the Bhagavad Gita. Nietzsche said of his own system that whether it made for death or life, time alone could prove; for life would triumph in the end and would bring him either victory or defeat—which of the two mattered not, seeing that Life would triumph. He hated the adoration of success. So Zarathustra, while instructing his disciples, as we have seen, that "it is a good war that justifies every cause," adds that they should have for their enemies such only as are hateful, not those who are contemptible. "You should be proud of your enemy: *thus the successes of your enemy are your successes also.*"†

This carelessness of results should be expressed in manner also, says Zarathustra. In all the "adventures" of life, in peace and in war, in joy and in disaster, the Super-man must exhibit the serenity of the *beau joueur*, the smiling grace of a dancer, the joyous simplicity of a child at play. He must laugh as the old gods laughed: he must laugh himself "beyond himself."‡

And he must be utterly self-reliant.

"I am going alone, O my disciples," says Zarathustra. "And now go ye also away, and alone. I wish it so.

"Verily I counsel you: Go forth from me and protect yourselves against Zarathustra! And better still: be ashamed of him. Perhaps he hath deceived you. . . .

"Ye say that ye believe in Zarathustra? But of what consequence

* W., VI, 208 ("So werde ich's wollen!").

† W., VI., 68.

‡ W., VI, 430.

is Zarathustra! Ye are my believers: but of what consequence are all believers!

"Ye had not yet sought yourselves: hence ye found me. Thus do all believers; and that is why all belief is of such little worth.

"Now I command you to lose me and to find yourselves; and only when all of you have renounced me, will I return unto you." *

Lastly, as the supreme achievement of the Super-man, he must *annihilate pity*. Zarathustra himself had almost been overcome by this besetting sin of man. "This new Table, oh my brothers, I give unto you: Become hard!" †

Nietzsche argued that in any case pity is only a form of egoism; whether we do good or evil to others, it is with the object of feeling our own power, and that we may bring others under our dominion. The aristocrat tries to bend his equals to his will; the slave is contented with easy triumphs and seeks to control others—the sick, the wretched—by pitying them. The aristocrat hates to be pitied; the slave enjoys it.

But apart from this, pity interferes with the law of natural selection; it tends to preserve those who, if left to themselves, would not survive in the struggle for existence, and who ought not to survive. Their survival increases the sum of misery in the world; directly, by perpetuating a degenerate, useless and miserable species; indirectly, in so far as the sight of pain, deformity, ugliness or sorrow is liable to disturb the balance of the Super-man, and even, either by excess of disgust or of compassion, to drag him down from his high estate to pessimism or to asceticism.

The inundation of pity into modern life, says Nietzsche, is only another proof that we have become effeminate, and that we are afraid of pain. We not only fear pain for ourselves; we cannot even bear the idea of suffering in others. Such cowardice, he says, like every other form of fear, is contemptible. Instead of abolishing suffering, he would make life harder than it has ever been. All human progress has been brought about by suffering. There is in man a creature and a creator. The creature needs "to be moulded, broken, hammered, rent, scorched, burnt, purified." ‡ Suffering is good for the creature and pity is out of place. The creator suffers, but scorns pity and should not be insulted by the sight of it.

Nietzsche did not stop there. Believing, as we have seen, that "slavery is one of the necessary conditions of a high culture," he declared that "the misery of men who vegetate, in pain, ought to be still further increased in order to allow a small number of olympian

* W., VI, 114, 115.

† W., VI, 312.

‡ W., VII, 185; *Jenseits von Gut und Böse*.

geniuses to produce great works of art.”* While, to spare future generations the depressing spectacle of misery and ugliness, we ought to have the courage, not only to leave those who are ripe for death to their fate, but to push them on their way even faster than they are inclined to go of their own accord. It is necessary for the Super-man, therefore, to be able to inflict suffering of all kinds without faltering. Even feeble women and slaves can endure. “But not to succumb to inner distress and uncertainty, when one inflicts severe pain and hears the cry of that pain—that is great, that is a condition of greatness.”†

Every surgeon ought to know how much truth there is in the sentence just quoted. But taken as a whole, “the annihilation of pity” is, to express it mildly, so unusual a doctrine, that some of Nietzsche’s disciples have endeavored to explain it on the ground that it is based upon his theory of the “Eternal Return.” For, granting the truth of that theory, and that those who are miserable (and soulless, be it remembered) must carry their cross eternally, it might be argued that it would be best to kill them at once, before they realize the horror of the fate in store for them. From that point of view, it is said, Nietzsche’s egotism may be traced to his excess of sympathy, while his seeming brutality is really a most refined and sublime altruism, converted, by “self-elevation,” into individualism.

This explanation may account for Nietzsche’s ultimate application of his doctrine—the destruction or removal of the pitiable. But his idea of the “Eternal Return” has nothing to do with his original condemnation of pity, for he attacked the morality of pity in his *Menschliches Allzumenschliches*, which he wrote during the years 1876 and 1877, and which was published in 1878; while we know that the “Eternal Return” did not occur to him until 1881.‡

It is as easy, however, to expose Nietzsche’s fallacies, which are innumerable, as it is to denounce him as an immoralist, which he avowedly was. That there are people whom he supplies with excuses for shortcomings which, under any other code, would trouble conscience, requires no explanation. But how account for his hold on so many others of a different kind, who are reasonable beings; who live orderly lives, and who in every way are what the world calls presentable and perhaps superior?

In the first place, he helps some people to face their pains and sorrows bravely, and to defy external conditions. In the second place, there are those who admire his titanic effort to be himself, to be an independent being, to throw off every outside influence, and to tell the truth as he saw it, at all costs, and regardless of how truth looked yesterday. Sometimes those who respect this quality, admit that

* W., IX, p. 98.

† W., V, 246; *Die fröhliche Wissenschaft*.

‡ *La Philosophie de Nietzsche*, par Henri Lichtenberger (1904), p. 160.

thought rabidly independent, he had not found sure ground of his own on which to stand, and that although his writings act on the few as a mental stimulant, they cannot fail to act on the many as a poison. But they admire him none the less on that account. His attempt rather than his achievement appeals to them.

Others, again, are attracted by his effort to express the inexpressible, or, rather, to paint the darkness he found within himself and which they, too, find within their hearts—a chaos of thought, a whirlpool of feeling, from which most people flee as from madness, but which he faced, studied, and portrayed so luminously that the darkness seems almost like Day. True, he never pierced to the light and to the stillness which lie beyond the darkness; but how few have! If he had done so, he would appeal to a very different order of minds. As it is, he fascinates those who, like himself, see chaos, but who, unlike himself, fear it.

It should be remembered, further, that but few people read all his works: fourteen large volumes. They read him in scraps—an aphorism, a poem, a paragraph taken at random. They read, for instance, the following poem, and, not knowing the peculiar sense in which he uses terms, they are charmed by his music and imagine also that he is expressing mystically their own ideal. Thus (perforce without the music):

THE LONELY ONE.

"Either to follow or to lead is hateful to me.

"Obey? No, and once more No. Reign?

"Who is not terrible to himself gives no one terror,

"And only he who terrorizes can lead others.

"It is hateful to me even to lead myself.

* * * * *

"I love to lose myself for a while, like some animal of the wood
or sea;

"To lie prostrate, meditating in sweet errantry.

"And at last, from far away, to entice myself homeward:

"To mislead myself unto myself."

A thousand meanings might be read into such words; but we have seen what he means by "self"—the body with its instincts—while probably the majority of those who read and admire his poem, know nothing of his philosophy.

He is liked, therefore, by some, chiefly because they do not understand him.

The real secret of his influence, however, seems to lie in this: that

he worships the modern god—Power. In so far as he voices the intuition that negative piety is ineffective, and that “the Kingdom of Heaven” can be taken by violence only, we follow him cordially. But when leading the reaction against mere “goodness,” against the mushy virtue of his epoch, instead of leading it in the direction of active, positive, even fiery beneficence, he turned to Power and lost himself in adoration: and here we cannot follow him.

In politics, both national and international; in finance, and in almost every other sphere of public activity, questions of moral right and wrong have come to be looked upon as side issues, while Power in itself is thought to justify practically anything. But this view, which is based to a considerable extent upon a misunderstanding of Darwinism (the survival of the fittest having been misinterpreted as the survival of the strongest), is applied popularly to public affairs only. Nietzsche, who, whatever his failings, never lacked courage, applied it to personal relations, too. Without troubling himself about Darwinism, and still less about logic, he was none the less more logical in his application of generally accepted principles than any other writer has been. For him, Power became not a means, but an end. And it is this that draws people to him—particularly those who lack power, and who either desire to be virile and masterful, or who think they are but are not, and who, in any case, enjoy the thrill which his magnificent eulogies of Power give them.

* * * * *

Nietzsche as an individual and as a writer, however, must remain insolvable to those who have not studied the phenomena of psychism and of mediumism. For he was mediumistic without knowing it, and he allowed himself to think that his psychic experiences were unique and conclusive. This left him at the mercy of practically any influence which, whether good or evil, was more positive intellectually than he was at the moment.

Writing some recollections of his life, during the autumn of 1888, Nietzsche spoke as follows of the way in which many of his works, and particularly his *Zarathustra*, had been produced.*

“Has any one, at the end of the nineteenth century, a clear conception of what poets of the strong age called Inspiration? If not, I will describe it. With the very least remains of superstition in him, any one would in fact hardly know how to throw aside the idea of being merely the incarnation, merely the mouthpiece, merely the medium of some superior power. It is the idea of revelation, in the sense that suddenly, with inexpressible certainty and distinction [“distinction”

* *Das Leben Friedrich Nietzsche's*, von Elisabeth Förster-Nietzsche; Vol. II, pp. 426, 427 (Leipzig, 1904).

rather in the sense of nobility], Something becomes visible and audible; Something most deeply moves and disturbs one. That describes simply a matter of fact. One hears—one does not seek; one takes—one does not ask who gives. Like lightning a thought flashes forth, of necessity, in fixed form and without a shadow of turning: I have never had any choice. An ecstasy, of which the tremendous tension sometimes dissolves in a flood of tears, and during which one's steps involuntarily become now precipitant, now slow; a complete externalization of oneself [*auszersichsein*, "beyond oneself"], with the most distinct consciousness of innumerable light [*feiner*] shudders and purlings [*überrieselungen*] right down to the toes; a depth of happiness, in which the utmost pain and gloom do not appear as a contrast, but as though consequent, as provoked, as a necessary colour within such an abundance of light; a flash [literally, an instinct] of rhythmical proportion spanning vast stretches of forms. . . . All this happens with absolute involuntariness, but as though in a tempest of feeling—the feeling of freedom, of utterness, of power, of divinity. The involuntariness of picture and of comparison, is the most remarkable thing about it. One no longer has any notion what picture or comparison is. Everything presents itself as the nearest, the most precise, the most simple Expression. . . .

"That is my experience of inspiration. I doubt not that one would have to go back a thousand years to find any one who would dare to say to me: 'It is also mine.'"

It is not surprising that the man who wrote the sentence last quoted died insane. Nietzsche's egotism was indeed stupendous. In a work of his, entitled *Ecce Homo*, which has come to light only since this present article was written, he prophesied that at his voice "the earth would be convulsed": he intended to cast among men a ferment of incomparable power. "I descend from heights where no bird has flown; I know depths where no human foot has ever strayed." And yet he could also say that he had no remembrance "of having ever made an effort; no struggle has been known in my life."

How unlike Madame Blavatsky. Inspiration, in a certain well-defined sense, she, too, claimed to receive; but instead of regarding her experience as unparalleled, she insisted that many persons in all ages have received similar inspiration, and that it is within the reach of every one who will serve an apprenticeship in the unselfish and faithful service of humanity.

E. T. H.

(To be continued.)

EARLY RELIGIONS IN AMERICA.

THESE are but few examples in history of a transplanted race remaining unaffected by the ideas prevalent in the land of its adoption. In almost every instance a conquering people absorbs and amalgamates indigenous opinion. Races, as a rule, intermingle in thought, even while they may remain socially separated.

For example, an Aryan invasion, showing absolute subordination of native races reduced to slavery, yet carried with it an appropriation by the conquerors, of indigenous religious observances. The religion of the conquerors suffered change.

In American history there is no trace of such conditions. The ideals of the barbaric and semi-barbaric tribes with which the white races came into contact may have undergone certain modifications (although this is questionable), but they had nothing that proved acceptable to European peoples. Spanish, French, and English in attempting the conquest of the new world successively overcame them without modification of their own religious convictions.

The early colonists of the sixteenth century were at that stage in human evolution in which politics and religion are inseparable. The awakening of the Renaissance had not, so far, divorced them; the leaven of true freedom could not, for at least another century, reach the common mind. Its ideal of Liberty was limited to political theories, as yet unproven. Liberty of opinion, as we know it, was indeed impossible. Such conception of it as existed, was of freedom of thought for oneself and the submission of others to that opinion, or, as was wittily said at a later period, to be orthodox was "to think as I think," and to be heterodox to think differently.

So certain was this that even advanced minds in those days held that difference of opinion led to Hell, and to a warm Hell at that. Burning at the stake was not yet wholly out of fashion, for the inquisition had reached the new world and claimed many victims in Mexico and Peru.

Deeply ingrained in the people's consciousness was the idea that religion and patriotism were akin, if not actually the same. For this reason, therefore, all deviations from accepted religious observance were in the nature of protest against established precedent. Every religious community arising at that time, within the pale of national religious organization, was born of rebellion. Hence the profound horror which was inspired by it in the minds of really estimable people. Kindly natures soured under this despotic

influence; and while, happily, there were not wanting stars of real magnitude in the galaxy of noble men and women, who even in early Colonial days believed in a greater toleration, they were rare.

We should expect to find the spirit of bigotry less violent among the Puritan colonists than among the Catholics, but this expectation is scarcely borne out by the facts. It may be claimed, perhaps, that they were somewhat less bloodthirsty. We find no exact parallel to the atrocities of Menendez who slaughtered men wholesale, "not because they were Frenchmen but because they were Lutherans." The French, in avenging themselves, left religion out of the question and hanged Spaniards, "not as Spaniards or mariners, but as traitors, murderers and robbers," which it may be conceded they were. The Puritans not only hanged, but occasionally burned for mere difference of opinion.

It is clear that toleration was not considered a virtue in the opening of the seventeenth century, although more virulent religious hatred had perhaps abated. The overweening power of Portugal and Spain was declining. Both these countries had acquired extensive settlements in America before the death of Queen Elizabeth, who with all her ambition had been singularly unfortunate as far as colonization was concerned. Notwithstanding her many pioneers, no permanent settlements had been achieved. The main value of her successive expeditions lay in the knowledge gained by them of the resources of the new world and of the great efforts which would be necessary to secure them.

It had been made clear that private enterprise was insufficient for purposes of colonization. And as Elizabeth lay dying, disappointed of her heroic anticipations, she was finally induced to give her royal guarantee that settlers in America should have the protection of full civic and religious rights. Under this promise Sir Thomas Gilbert, more fortunate than his half brother, Raleigh, brought his ship to Virginia, and laid the foundation of the first of the thirteen colonies.

In due time the church bells of the mother-country were heard in the land of adoption and Protestant baptisms were being held in a font hewn out of the trunk of an old tree.

Honest churchgoing was expected of every resident in the new colony, and the seed of religious liberty fell upon barren soil in Virginia, for when, later on, Puritan pilgrims from New England arrived there, they were driven away with insult and ignominy. A few Huguenot and Scotch-Irish Presbyterians only were encouraged to remain as having proved themselves good colonists apart from their religion.

The beginnings of New England, the settlements in Massa-

chusetts, Connecticut, New Hampshire and Rhode Island are too well known to detain us as history, but they have vital interest for us in a study of the religious influences of that period.

It is difficult to recognize in the self-assertive spirit of the pioneers of those early days the leaven of future liberty—"lovers of peace" they have been called, but they never willingly yielded a conviction or admitted the possibility of another point of view from their own.

The immortal colonisers of New England held their convictions by direct inheritance from the Lollards, whose intense religious enthusiasm had been combined with a desire for personal independence. The early editions of the Bible had brought home to every thinking man the possibilities of private interpretation with an unflinching belief in the verbal inspiration of the sacred book. At the same time the teachings of Calvin had emphasized personal responsibility and were gaining ground everywhere. Politics and religion being at that time undivorced it not unnaturally happened that self-assertive religious views were prostituted to advance ambition. As a result we find the greater number of the prominent clergy and successful merchants of English towns were Puritans and every one of the forty counties of the mother country contributed its quota to her colonies.

The conditions there were of course different but human nature was the same. The extremists among the new arrivals were soon recognized, the Separatists and Brownites or Barrowites (so called for their leader) were surprisingly zealous in making converts, and however seriously they might disagree upon points of doctrine, upon one matter they were all in agreement. Their hatred of ecclesiasticism was universal. Interference with individual opinion or judgment was not to be endured from bishop, church or state. Every man had a right to be damned if he wished and the way was made easy for him. It was not necessary to break many of the Commandments to be consigned to Hell—a small matter sufficed for it in the opinion of his contemporaries.

But the Puritans, in spite of their prominence can never have been popular in their generation. We read that in London a Separatist being "catcht" "they kicked him so vehemently as if they meant to beat him to a jelly, and," adds the chronicler, "no matter if they had beaten the whole tribe likewise." Raleigh has left on record that in his day these independent Puritan sects had a membership of 20,000.

America with its unwritten laws and promise of freedom in religious observance could not fail to attract persons whose disregard of the royal prerogatives extended to a belief in two kings, "Christ

Jesus the King and *His* Kingdom the church, whose *subject*. James the First is, of whose kingdom not a king nor a lord nor a head but a member only!"

Fiske says of the early Puritans, "It was their glory that they insisted upon the law of righteousness and required that conduct should be conformed to it. Health of the soul and the approbation of God were objects of supreme regard." Earnest they undoubtedly were, upright and honorable, but often hardly lovable. They could hate well, "the microbe of superiority" had invaded them and punishment for minor offenses against their own ideas or right was the breath of their nostrils. The liberty they demanded for themselves they were unwilling to grant to others. Their daily life was hedged about with thorns of repentance for innocent acts, "The mote in the brother's eye loomed large."

Fiske says that every Puritan who settled in America became of necessity a Separatist, vehemently opposed both to political and ecclesiastical authorities. Yet of religious liberty in our sense they knew nothing; it was as regards virtue only that they were in the vanguard. An inflexible conscience, a narrow mind and too often a far from tender heart distinguished many of them, and when a really enlightened man arose in a community the best use that could be found to put him to was to persecute him! Thus Roger Williams, who, although in some ways erratic, was a truly enlightened man, suffered at the hands of his fellow colonists and was driven from Massachusetts. His was a rare liberality, rare even in our own day. He dared to believe in absolute soul liberty; the right, that is, of every human being to find out and believe truth as it appeared to him personally. Nothing remained for the zealots but to banish him and Rhode Island had, and has, cause to rejoice in the narrow-mindedness of his contemporaries. The three towns of Providence, Portsmouth, and Newport were incorporated under his most liberal charter. They suffered, it is true, from a surplus of liberty. Many independent spirits like himself, with less ballast of character appeared in all three communities. A certain Samuel Gorton arose to confound him with his lawless fanaticism. He claimed for himself and followers liberty amounting to license and was, in fact, a complete demagogue. He had been publicly whipped at Portsmouth, but that did not bridle his tongue; finally he was tried in Boston for blasphemous language and banished, and we lose sight of him in England, after, as Roger Williams puts it, he had succeeded in "bewitching and bemaddening poor Providence with his unclean censures of all ministers and all visible ordinances."

Roger Williams himself underwent many changes of heart and several baptisms, but he remained faithful to his principle of soul

liberty, and thousands had reason to bless him, albeit, life in Rhode Island was uneasy and unsettled, frequented as it was by sects of the most opposite opinions. Familists, Antinomians, Anabaptists, each in their turn cordially abhorred by orthodox religious citizens.

The famous Anne Hutchinson, mother of fifteen children, founder of the Antinomian sect in America, went to Boston in 1634 to enjoy the preaching of John Cotton. Her teaching was the assertion of an inward revelation as more important than the sanctification of a good life. In a community in which conduct was the supreme test such an announcement threatened the peace of the colony. And there was no concealment in those days; private opinion was public property and these heresies were thrashed out in many a committee and council chamber until the sinner, having been held up to every ignominy, was publicly excommunicated. The Antinomians had arisen in the days of Luther as disciples of one of his followers, John Agricola. Luther, however, considered them as heretics—their chief tenet was the absence of law under the Gospel, or, as Anne Hutchinson put it, a personal inward revelation. The perfectionists in our own day hold a similar belief. After Anne Hutchinson's excommunication in Boston she went to Rhode Island with many of her sympathisers, spreading great unrest and becoming the leader of a sect there. Her later history is tragic; after her husband's death she withdrew to New Amsterdam, where she met with a violent fate at the hands of Indians.

It is very interesting to trace the actual evolution of the partial ideal of liberty which animated the earlier settlers in New England. In reality their purpose was to find some place where they and all who agreed with them could enjoy the liberty of their opinions, but it was soon clear that much difference of opinion existed even between co-religionists, and it became certain that if authority were placed in the hands of the unorthodox, difficulties of many kinds would arise. Hence the Puritans changed the accepted order of things and demanded that "no one should be elected a free man who was not a member of one of the recognized churches and that all meetings of whatever kind should be held in a church"—for which reason all churches in New England, as you are aware, are known as meeting houses. It was perhaps the greatest misfortune of that time that individual interpretation of the Bible was encouraged. Baptists, Quakers, Pilgrims, all alike believed in expounding according to their own light, and persons wholly unqualified for thinking were called upon to perform that difficult operation, the rarest achievement, as Emerson has said, that can be expected of a human being.

When the Quakers in due time arrived in New England fuel

was added to the flame—their appearance was in itself an intrusion. They were not at that time animated by the quiet, peace loving principles we associate with them, but were possessed of most belligerent tongues. Among them were many fanatics on fire with religious zeal, conceiving themselves to be the favored agents of God to pronounce anathemas.

Their openly expressed piety distressed the Pilgrims, their *criticisms* enraged them and persecution followed their every attempt to colonize; violence worthy of the Dark Ages was accompanied by a total disregard of the law of love, which was supposed to reign supreme. After four Quakers had been hanged in Boston for various delinquencies, the time was ripe for their complete expulsion. There they had been looked upon as worse than a pestilence. They outraged public opinion by often walking nude through the frequented streets, and apart from all minor aggravations the bigotry which prevailed in New England at that time was severe enough to drive them away.

In 1673 President Oakes of Harvard College made this remarkable statement: "I look," he said, "upon toleration as the first born of the abominations." We must admit that there was little danger of his being contaminated by it, it was simply non-existent. "Toleration," said Cotton Mather, "has made the world anti-Christian." With such principles we can readily understand the later tragedies of Salem, tragedies bitterly repented by the agents themselves.

It is no matter for surprise that the unwelcome Quakers turned towards other colonies. Many went to Virginia to meet an equal persecution there, others more fortunate found their way to Pennsylvania, the colonization of which state offered most encouragement to students of liberal religion.

In that colony were to be found sects of every variety holding diametrically opposite opinions. Among them were numbered Episcopalians, Non-Conformists, Lutherans, Dutch Reformers, Catholics and Anglicans, beside Quakers. The Catholics, to be sure, were in a minority, the Quakers in the ascendant, and in the peaceful atmosphere of Penn's administration, they became less erratic and settled down into the order-loving and serene people we now know and esteem.

As time passed, the middle colonies became representative of a broader spiritual ideal. In none of them was there a state church or indeed ecclesiastical interference of any kind. Political liberty was well on its way, and if we once rid ourselves thoroughly of the idea that *religious liberty* was at any time the aim of the first settlers, it clears the way for a fuller recognition of the part they

played in human evolution, a part of immense importance, for we owe our own freedom to these sturdy pioneers.

But when they insisted that all their political representatives should belong to their particular church, the violence of their attempt at theocracy brought about a necessary reaction. The politicians themselves rebelled, it was hard to be rigidly orthodox and politically sane at the same moment, and New England's theocracy not only carried the seed of its own failure but offered a deterrent object lesson to other colonies. As Cotton Mather puts it, "In this world a state church is impossible wherein enters nothing that defiles."

Pennsylvania was too wise to follow that questionable experiment, the liberality of her earlier settlers worked as a continual leaven. Good citizenship was from the first considered more important than points of doctrine. Penn himself was essentially large-minded; he was acquainted with the hearts of men and he realised that excellence is not confined to one sect, people or race. "Our first concern," says one of his early settlers, Robert Prout, "was to keep up and maintain our religious worship, and as we had nothing but love in our hearts, we had comfort in our meetings from time to time and after them we assisted each other in building little houses." Penn's own treatment of the so-called heathen Indians was in accordance with his character. He won their love. He possessed in an eminent degree wisdom as the result of a perfect sincerity. Pennsylvania remained hospitable to all forms of religion, and her wide embrace included many nondescript sects whose very names are forgotten, beside Irish Catholics, Scotch Presbyterians and Non-conformists, Anabaptists, German Lutherans, Poles, Swedes and Dutch, each holding firmly to the religion of his ancestors. Prominent among her many sects were the Dunkers, known also as Tunkers or Dumplers, who established themselves in New Amsterdam. They originated in 1708 as followers of a certain Alexander Mack of Schwartzenau, but they had hardly organized before persecution drove them to Holland. From that country they emigrated in small numbers to Pennsylvania in 1720. They established their first community at Germantown, Philadelphia, and gradually formed settlements in New England, Maryland, Virginia, Ohio and New Amsterdam. They, as a sect, still exist and hold peculiar views in regard to marriage, which, if not absolutely forbidden, was much discouraged by them. At one time they numbered 30,000, but at present there are but 8,000 of them in America. Among the many sects mentioned they probably held the most original views, growing out of a perfectly literal interpretation of the New Testament. The heterogeneous mixture of her population deprived Pennsylvania of

the muscular religious character of Virginia and New England; the numerical superiority of her Quakers made her non-combatant, and, as a result, she offers less history in the sense of stirring events than most of her sister colonies.

New Jersey in her own way was somewhat akin to her, a healthy, pleasant, plentiful country, whose government was based upon two *leges*, *first*, reference to the royal laws of God, his name and true worship, which is spirit and truth, *second*, the good peace and welfare of individual persons.

The same standard, perhaps less graphically expressed, distinguished New Amsterdam. It was the refuge of every persecuted sect. Stuyvesant himself desired "that the great waste lands which might feed a hundred thousand inhabitants" should be settled and cultivated by the oppressed, "on the one side," he writes, "by the Roman Catholics and on the other by the Turks in Hungary, and upon the confines of Germany." Within her gates the early Dutch settlers peacefully hob-nobbed with French, Prussians, Germans, Bohemians, Swiss Independents, Norway Calvinists and Danes. Jews were excluded from the army, but this was their sole disability, and although slaves were bought and sold, no Christians were sold unless under criminal sentence.

On the Island of Manhatta, says a writer in the *Toques Papers*, there are four or five hundred men of different sects, there are men here of eighteen different languages. The public religion was Calvinistic, but, while there were restrictive laws, they were never enforced.

The smaller colony of New Hampshire seethed with religious unrest. Anne Hutchinson's influence there was disastrous, and in 1638 there arose a certain tanner, gifted with eloquence, who asserted that "gifts and graces were anti-Christ himself, and that the devil and Holy Spirit dwelled side by side in every human being." He had many disciples, but most of them found their way into Delaware. Both Delaware and New Hampshire early lost individuality, the one being merged in New England, and the other becoming a sort of appanage of Pennsylvania. Their religious history remained undefined, Delaware being largely influenced by Quakers and Baptists opposed to one another in principle, but not inimical in daily life.

So dominant was the religious spirit in those early days that we scarcely find a colony unaffected by it. North Carolina had perhaps least religious complexion. The history of her settlement is obscure, and although many Quakers migrated there, an indifference to doctrine and doctrinal points prevailed. In the French colonies we naturally recall the persecutions of the Huguenots and the terrible barbarities connected with them, sometimes bringing

about the total extinction of that unwelcome sect; but they belong rather to the history of New France, as it was called, and Florida.

Maryland, which was from the first given over to the tobacco planters, mainly Catholics, was characterized as Godless and profane. "The Protestant planters listened neither to God nor His commandments, and loved neither church nor cloister. Their clergy travel for their own profit, but the Catholics have freedom and are cared for by Godly priests."

Wherever we find Catholicism there was as a rule unity, and not the splitting up into sects so familiar in the eastern and middle colonies. The reason is obvious enough. The priests allowed no private interpretation of the Bible, and no discussion upon points of doctrine. Authority once established, was without appeal, and in this fact lay the certainty of their propaganda.

South Carolina, when welcoming her first settlers, the Scotch-Irish, guaranteed freedom to all except Papists, but spirituality was at a low ebb and her planters were more concerned with the enjoyment of this world than the care of their souls, and seem to have had only one positive conviction, to wit, "That no church at all was better than the Church of England." Dissenters were welcome of any shade of opinion, and it was explicitly provided in her constitution that no man should be obliged to pay church rates, or attend any religious service unless of his own free will.

Nothing in the history of religious thought in America is more amazing than the growth of her toleration of Catholicism. One is at a loss to account for it. Covered with ignominy and reproaches, in the early colonial days, 1782 saw them free to worship where and when they pleased in every one of the thirteen colonies; an amazing record of change in public opinion when we reflect that in Georgia, as late as 1732, all religious rights were denied them.

Georgia herself was awakened from religious apathy by the Methodists, who, however, gave her a bad reputation as "The Land of Lies," but before they arrived in America the spirit of the population had undergone a change. The power of the clergy was waning—whereas in the beginning the pastors in New England met every three weeks to deliver the people from heresies, to determine the value of prophecies, and to regulate religious utterances, as time passed they met far less frequently. The men of the various settlements, traveling from place to place and intermingling with those of broader views, little by little fell away from grace, and the laxity of their views threatened the spiritual life of many places. Then what was known as the half covenant decree was accepted and, in Boston (1657), adults who had been baptized in infancy but who were not considered regenerate by themselves or others, were

allowed to bring their children to baptism, and the practice of inviting persons not morally worthy to the sacrament grew up and formed an entering wedge for license. Laxities of discipline, combined with prosperous times, wrought a great change. We are all less disposed to religion when things go well with us. "In New Amsterdam unqualified persons presumed to act as teachers," says the chronicler, "and to expound the Holy Word without ecclesiastical authority."

Although private conventions were forbidden under pain of heavy fines and persons resorting to them, whether married or single, male or female, were obliged to pay £25 for the delinquency, they yet spread rapidly. Sects multiplied. The Mennonites in Pennsylvania attained such proportions that it was feared they would determine an election in Philadelphia. In 1735 an exasperated editor writes: "I trust you will thrash every sheriff or inspector, Quaker or Mennonite, to a jelly, and further that no Mennonite or German should be admitted to give a ticket unless he is sworn as naturalized and worth £50. Let this be known and it will keep great numbers of the Mennonites at home. In addition, I would have all our friends provided with a good shillelagh as if determined to put it into execution, in this way you may carry your election, for I am well assured that not a third of the Mennonites are naturalized." As the original Mennonites in America numbered 33 members among 11 families they must have been great propagandists. Later on they became largely merged among the Quakers.

Moravians from the Rhine were also to be found in most of the middle colonies and formed a large proportion of later colonists in Georgia, but they dwelled peaceably with the main body of the church-goers. Bigotry was dying out as the Seventeenth Century drew to a close, and with it that fervor of difference of opinion which had distinguished its beginning. It became difficult to distinguish Presbyterians from Congregationalists; the terms were often interchangeable; Baptists and Quakers were even tolerated and church discipline was so completely relaxed in several of the larger towns that scepticism lifted its head: but, when prosperous conditions in many of the colonies were followed by a period of business depression, religious uneasiness reawakened, and the time was obviously ripe for a greater effort by those who had remained orthodox. Stern revivalists arose, who, first springing up in Connecticut, soon carried their message over the entire country. Intense religious excitement prevailed, quickly becoming epidemic, and the people, aroused to a sense of their danger, once more groaned under a conviction of sin and of fear of loss of divine favor. Jonathan Edwards arose to spiritualize his own and future generations, and as he

preached and taught, an excitement prevailed which it would be almost impossible to parallel in history. Religious emotion of the intenser kind awakened, and while periods of great spiritual excitement have been frequent in many parts of the world, such overwhelming emotion is more rarely found where there is as high a general level of education as then prevailed in the colonies, and the eloquence of Jonathan Edwards and of his immediate successors was addressed to the cultivated intellect.

It is perhaps a matter of surprise to us to find in Jonathan Edwards a poetic faculty of the highest kind. Like Dante he used his imaginative powers to depict the terrors of the world to come for the unsaved; but he was also finely sensitive to beauty in nature. He who condemned unbaptised infants to Hell, and gave no hope to the unrepentant sinner, described the soul of a true Christian as "Such a little white flower as we see in the spring of the year, low and humble on the ground, opening its bosom to receive the pleasant beams of the sun's glory, rejoicing, as it were, in a calm rapture, diffusing around sweet fragrances, standing peacefully and lovingly among the other flowers round about, all opening their bosoms to the sun."

Thus the first century of English Colonization in America closed as it began in religious fervor, but it was somewhat of a different kind. Jonathan Edwards, little as he would have liked to own such a result, had paved the way for Methodism, but Methodism appealed far more to the heart than to the intellect. It, in its way, levelled distinctions, it had no set creed. It prepared the way for our broader humanitarianism, and as its teachings found their first field among the slaves of Maryland and Virginia, they brought hope and renewal of confidence to the oppressed. Its pioneers, Whitfield and the brothers Wesley, sowed their seed broadcast. Their methods were remarkable, practical and far reaching as they remain to-day; with their itinerant preachers—wide circuits dividing the country into easily accessible districts—continual exhortations with rude eloquence and personal examples—and close relation to the converts—they succeeded marvelously in their propaganda. They carried far—not fire and sword—but rather the assurances of brotherhood, of forgiveness of sins and of salvation, and undoubtedly their experience meetings largely increased their influence.

William Blacke, visiting Philadelphia somewhat later, has left us an amusing account of the preachers. He relates how he went to church with a young company to hear one of the popular disciples of the great Whitfield, whose followers are called "The New Lights," and he remarks: "He delivered his doctrine with as good grace, split his text as judicially, turned up the whites of his eyes

as theologically, cuffed his cushion as orthodoxly, and twisted his band as primitively as Master Whitfield himself." Later in the day he went to a Quaker meeting, where he found one of the traveling friends laboring powerfully under the spirit, "One sentence came so fast on the heel of another, I was in great pain of his choking. However, we had patience to hear him out, and after a little pause we broke up."

Turn where we may in the early chronicles it is always a talk of religion that awaits us. The New England Colonies more particularly were all conscience bound, and the more uncomfortable their condition, the more certain they were of winning Divine favour.

After the preachings of Whitfield, the rise of the Methodist Episcopal Church was rapid, and strangely enough its first public celebration was co-incidental with the opening of the first New England Catholic church, which was established in Boston. Thus extremes were represented and both these missionary efforts were crowned with success; and, in our own day these two religious bodies represent numerically the result of the religious zeal of two centuries, and both, probably from the same cause, differently directed, for to both the intellectual appeal was secondary—the Puritans and Pilgrims had sowed discord by their confident acceptance of individual interpretation of the Scriptures; they expected enlightenment through obscure channels; the Catholics, on the contrary, left controversy alone, and bade obedience follow faith. Both taught other worldliness to those whose experiences had discouraged them with their present universe. The Methodists, while they allowed discussions, cared not at all that the conclusions should be intellectually sound; they relied upon feelings common to everyone, and governed the people by their knowledge of these emotions.

The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries were big with enterprise and zeal and equally so with religious fervor. Men travailed in spirit, but the questions which filled their minds were not those which have agitated succeeding generations. Doubts of the existence of the soul and of immortality had not reached the common mind. The idea of the Soul and its value was dominant, its salvation was the one important point.

The hard bed rock of dogmatic certainty yielded very slowly to the speculations of those more advanced intellects which were to herald liberty with high thinking in the transcendental movement as distinct from the dreaded liberty and laxity of thought, which haunted the Pilgrims. And if, like the airships of to-day, the supporting balloons of the new ideal occasionally exploded of their own intensity, yet the upward movement left ineradicable traces for the pioneers of our more scientific thought to follow.

The Eighteenth Century also travailed in darkness and misery of heart that the Nineteenth might blaze a trail for the Twentieth, and such of us as remember the birth of the scientific spirit in religious controversy realize that the liberality of opinion, which is more and more manifest among ourselves, is due to two interrelated causes; to a reaction from the dogmatic self-assertion which distinguished the early colonists on the one hand, and, on the other, to that love of individual opinion and determination to express it which, unlovely in itself, yet tends to a healthy individualism—an individualism destined—if the signs of our time may be relied upon, to rise into universality and to show forth, as its divinest proof, the Spirit of Toleration.

J. E. RUUTZ-REES.

"I think we have got used to drugging our Consciousness in various ways (not with drugs, but with actions), for rest. And it is a wrong rest. So we have to learn the true mode, which is by sinking back into the Silence. When one does so sink back one feels it at once, and if one can only find one minute in which to do it, there is an extraordinary steady-ing power in it."

BOOK OF ITEMS.

THE RELIGION OF THE WILL.*

THE WILL IN THE SOUL.

III. SOCIETY.

TWO aspects of the Will in the Soul have been considered: first, that which forms the driving-power in the mind, and leads to the building up of general notions, the deducting of concepts; and, second, the power which forms the constructive impulse of our emotional life, the power of desire. There remains one other fundamental aspect, widely differing in scope and range from these two, yet using them both: the driving power which leads to the association of human beings in lesser or greater groups, bound together by some general feeling of love or hatred for the same things, united by some common aim, drawn together by an aspiration, an ideal held by all.

And, while the operation of the will in mind and emotion may be considered with regard to the separate person, this larger aspect of the Will in the Soul, with which we are now concerned, of necessity implies more persons than one; it implies an assembling of persons, and therefore implies the power which brings them together, and holds them together.

With that binding and uniting power, mind, in the stricter sense, has little to do. On the contrary, it acts very efficiently, when mind is not very active, or, indeed, is hardly active at all. One might, in truth, say that this binding together of human souls takes place in spite of mind, and that mind is often its greatest adversary.

Will anyone who knows human life affirm that the association of simple, natural persons, country folk or savages or children, is the result of reason, or any ordered process of mind, whether conscious or unconscious? Does the peasant or the savage or the child say to himself: I, who move and act and gesticulate thus and thus, am a self-conscious being, possessed of a something which shines within me, and which, for the sake of argument, may be called a soul; this other peasant or savage or child, whose inverted image imprints itself on my retina, whom, briefly, I see in front of me, makes analogous movements and gesticulations; therefore, arguing by analogy, though it must be confessed analogy is but a broken reed to lean upon, yet arguing by analogy I am justified in

*Copyright 1908, by Charles Johnston.

affirming that this other peasant or savage or child has likewise a self-conscious something shining within him, which, once more for the sake of argument, I may again call a soul. It follows that there is a certain kinship, or mutual relation, or reciprocal function, between our two souls; therefore I shall acknowledge that relationship by hailing this kindred soul, or by throwing a javelin at him, as the case may be?

Does anyone pretend that human intercourse is the outcome of any such chain of argument as this? Is it not rather the case that, just in so far as this kind of argument is indulged in, the direct and simple sense of relationship comes into peril, and the kindly word or the throwing of the javelin becomes more problematical? Does it not often happen, with this, as with so many good arguments, that the train of thought may leave the rails and find itself in the jungle or morass? Is the hypothetical and most dialectical child or peasant or savage, or philosopher for the matter of that, not in danger of falling into some such strain as this: I am, or seem to myself to be, a moving, acting, living creature, possessed of a hypothetical somewhat, which seems to be in my inward parts, and which some people, assuming for the moment, what has not been proved, that they are other people, have agreed to call a soul, but which may be only a will-o'-the-wisp, flickering in my hypothetical brain; well, here I am, or am not, as the case may be; and there is, or is not, a certain moving, or seemingly moving, somewhat, which seems to be making movements, ambulatory, gesticulatory and other, such as I seem to be making myself; or rather such as this will-o'-the-wisp, which agreed, for arguments' sake, to call itself a soul, has the impression that it is superintending, or at least observing; well, is this will-o'-the-wisp justified in concluding, or even in assuming, because of the said gyrations in that other hypothetical somewhat, that those gyrations revolve about another will-o'-the-wisp, which, oh most astonishing assumption, may haply also call itself a soul? Surely that is too big an assumption for such a small bit of evidence to carry? Surely this will-o'-the-wisp is in no position to affirm anything that has the least validity about itself, much less, therefore, about anything else!

That is the kind of mental debility a too unrestrained use of argument may lead us into; and it is wholly certain that nothing so sane, cheerful and virile as human society, even the society of savages, was ever built on a quaking platform like that. Society, beginning with the association of two people, whether in love or war, never sprang from anything so confused and tottering as argument. It had its birth in something far more direct and

simple: namely, the intuition of other human souls. That is the true driving power in all human society, and argument is but a latter day luxury, and, like many another luxury, rather a source of weakness than of strength.

This intuition of other human souls is as primal, as fundamental, as that other inherent certainty with which we began our consideration of the Will; the certainty that we can exert our wills upon external things, so that we are able to lift the book from the table, or to walk around the room, as often as we please, by merely exerting the will which we know we possess. Akin to this primal certainty in character, though not in object, is the new certainty which we are now considering, the certainty that there are other human souls, and that we can come into relation with them.

This intuitive certainty of the existence of other human souls has been the driving power of all human life, from its simplest or most savage beginnings, whichever they may have been; this same certainty of the existence of other human souls is, at this moment, the driving power of all human life, and will so continue, until the great Consummation, when it yields its place to a higher power.

Consider a village of some genuinely primitive savages, such as, let us say, the Papuans of New Guinea. They are born, and marry, and go to war and die, in cheerful certainty each of his or her own existence, and in like certainty of the genuinely human existence of each other. The mother believes in the real human existence of her baby, and will go to all lengths in obedience to her belief; will, indeed, go so far as to set the value of that small, dusky life higher than the value of her own, sacrificing herself with implicit faith, to save or shelter the diminutive Melanesian who clings to her breast.

In like manner, the young chief will collect his doughty men in his finely carved war-canoe, and go forth with them on wild and magnificent adventures; never doubting that they are of like being with himself, and his own kindred life never doubted by his warriors. They will cruise, perhaps, around many a flowery peninsula, haunted by lovely birds of paradise, and, in due time, will come to some other village, standing, like an antique lake-dwelling, up to its ankles in the sea. And there, with wild yells and rushes, they will cut and fight and kill; never doubting for an instant that the folk they are killing or enslaving are genuine human folk; and even when, in the wild exultation of victory, they make a red banquet of the fallen foe, they do not doubt the essential humanity of those whom they are benevolently assimilating round the fire.

So they love and hate, court and marry and kill, bear babes and eat their enemies, with wholesome and whole-hearted convic-

tion, resting on the primal will in them, which drives them into relations of union or concussion with these others, and all the while implicitly believing that the others are of like being with themselves, human lives just as they are. Here is the intuitive certainty of the existence of other human souls, in that far-off, shark-eating, cannibalistic isle of beauty, with its essentially sane and wholesome human life.

Will it be objected that there is nothing distinctively human in this: that crows recognise the kindred being of crows, or cats of cats? Certainly they do. And few things are less flattering to the self-elected lords of creation than the manners of these self-same cats, who have consented to dwell with us for long ages now, but will never, on any account, consent to do anything merely because we wish them to, unless it also pleases their lordly and indifferent selves. If one watches a cat, let us say from the back room of one of those houses in London, that look out over small high-walled gardens expressing the very essence of the great heresy of separateness; if we watch a cat prowling forth in one of the small, oblong gardens, and leap, light as a bubble, on the wall, we shall at once become aware that puss is looking out for, and deigning to notice, not human beings, if any should chance to be within his ken, but cats, tom-cats, tabbly-cats, kittens, big or little, plain or brindled, so long as they be cats and therefore kindred spirits, folk of his own bad race.

Perfectly true, this kinship prevails among cats or crows or wolves or any race of living things, from herrings to elephants. But when we come to human folk, there seems to be a difference of degree, just as there is in the mental and emotional life of human beings, as compared with that of animals. But this treatise in no wise seeks to disparage our brother the elephant or our sister the ass; we are not desirous of making comparisons to their detriment, just as we are not seeking to explore the workings of their minds and hearts. We are simply trying to ascertain a few broad truths concerning human beings, and those lesser people come into the saga only incidentally.

And it is quite certain, whatever may be the relations of these lesser lives among themselves, tender and cordial as they certainly are, or whatever may be our own relation toward them, that our relations toward each other, toward other human beings, are of a different kind. We recognise in human beings a something of kin and likeness, be it only sin and the sorrow that sin brings; we acknowledge, whether consciously or unconsciously, a bond, a closeness, a vividness and force of relation, which we feel toward human beings, and toward human beings alone. This intuition of humanity is the great driving power in our invisible life. For it seems to be

quite accurately true that, where we are concerned with genuinely human life, we are concerned with the man invisible, not with the visible man. We have already enumerated the visible man's activities, as the search for food, migration to new regions, the continuation of his kind, and we have sought to show wherein these are common to men and other animals, and wherein they are peculiar to mankind, or shared only by the animals corrupted by mankind. All this is the life of the visible man.

But when we enter genuinely human life, the life of the Soul, or middle nature of man, we have to do no longer with the visible man but with the man invisible. No one ever saw love and hate, ambition or fear, though we have all seen their outer manifestations. Just as the Will is invisible, yet supremely real, so are all these powers and passions, which are but branches and offshoots of the Will; which have the Will as their driving power, just as Energy is the driving power in such manifestations as light and heat, electricity and magnetism. And, just as the electric spark may carry a message of love, or the force of sharp dissolution, as in the lightning-flash, so may the heart of man be kindled with love or inflamed by hate. Just as magnetism may draw together the filings and the iron core, or may drive two magnets apart, so our human feelings may make for oneness or for hostility. Yet the one driving power is there, under these dissonant manifestations. It is the impulse to come into relation with other human beings, resting on the implicit certainty that such relation is possible, that brings about all the dramas of our human life.

Therefore we speak of the Will in the Soul as a quite distinct realm of manifestation of this marvelous and universal power. And, once we have come to recognise its existence, and have given it a separate name, we are led to marvel more and more at its limitless range, its insistence, its strong compelling and binding power throughout the whole of human life.

We have considered the search for food, as it is common to man and animals less than man; and we have seen how the instinct of self-preservation, carried over into the psychic realm, the human soul, may become ambition, egotism, self-seeking and self-asserting. But there is a wider and more impersonal aspect of this same power; besides its narrow and detrimental action, it has a larger field, where the personal force is used and overruled by the great impersonal Life, the universal Will, in which all individual wills rest. Let us consider the working of personal power and ambition through human life and history.

Leadership is not solely a human quality. There is much of it in a pack of wolves, a herd of antelopes, a flock of crows. There,

also, we see dominance, the union of superior insight and superior force, exercising a guarding and guiding power which has a direct influence on the well-being and advance of the wolves or crows or antelopes. Animals which lead this grouped life have certain decided advantages in the struggle for life, and therefore in evolution.

The same thing is decidedly true in human life. First, patriarchal families, then clans and tribes, then nations, gain a marked advantage in the world-struggle, through massed formations and grouped energies and forces. Through this advantage, the genius and typical activity of some one nation may be reinforced, steadied and strengthened, till it becomes a factor in the development of the whole human race.

Wars, national rivalries and contests, political, commercial, industrial, are all but phases of this same human energy, the Will working through massed formation in ordered and organised energies. The direct action of these massed forces on every individual included in them is immense. It is one of the steadiest and most educative powers in life, and affects the individual in countless ways, all of which may be classed as the training of will and consciousness. Let us for a moment consider the matter from this latter point of view, the training of consciousness.

Beneficent Nature, which watches over the outward concerns of man and animal alike, has provided, in family life, a means for the continuance of race and species and type; and at the same time something more. For family life is the field of that "struggle for others" which is the great moralising and broadening force in the struggle for life. How fine and harmonious, how full of fidelity and constancy is the family life of many animals, we have already seen. Human life does not show at its best, when compared with the house-keeping of doves or wild geese or monkeys.

But there is in our human life, as compared with that of the lesser animals, a new and added factor. We are conscious of a kinship, whether of love or hate, with human beings, which we do not feel or recognise toward any lesser life, however faithful or winsome. Love and hate, in their true sense, are compliments we pay to human beings alone.

So our family life is a training ground for love and hate, in a deeper sense than is the family life of doves or love-birds. Our psychic wealth is greater, our souls have a wider scope, our consciousness has new elements, whether of imagination or desire, abstraction or aspiration; and all these new elements come into play, in the invisible part of us, in all human association, beginning with family life.

Thus the family is the first training ground for common will

and common consciousness. Whatever be the character of its members, gay or grave, simple or sublime, it is certain that each member of a family living together constantly holds in mind all the other members of the family, whether to aid or oppose them, whether for assistance or self-defence. Thus each member of the family has, as it were, at once a particular and personal consciousness and a general, family consciousness. In the latter each holds in mind all the members of the family, himself or herself, side by side with all the others. Thus each member of the family has, in a sense, the same consciousness, is conscious of the same things, namely, the family membership in its massed form; a general or collective consciousness is thus set up, in which loves and hates, likes and dislikes, preferences and jealousies all play their part.

And, be it noted, the possession of this common consciousness in no sense lessens the individual consciousness of each member of the family. For while each holds all in thought, thus making for unity, at the same time each thinks of all the others in his or her own way, and thus holds the common consciousness with a difference, as the old masters of heraldry used to say. Both unity of consciousness and individuality are thus preserved; and the fuller the unity, the more perfect is the individuality of each; since more things are regarded from the individual point of view, and they are more deeply regarded.

Tribe or clan consciousness carries the same lesson of life a step farther. Here, as in simple family life, the fact of blood-relationship, or at least a belief in its existence, binds the clan or tribe together with a certain warmth of feeling and common interest. The training and development of the wills of individuals is carried into new and larger fields, when tribal war and tribal meetings for justice or common decisions, bring new relations beyond the reach of simple family life. With these new relationships comes a new and wider common consciousness; and the early tribesman of Athens or Rome, or the Norman or Macdonald or O'Neill, has a definite consciousness as such tribesman, which he shares with every other member of the tribe or clan, in virtue of clan kinship, and from which all other human beings whatsoever are excluded, be they valiant as Alexander or wise as Lycurgus. The tribal bard and orator and historian minister to this tribal consciousness in an effective and purely human way, which the far sweeter lay of song-thrush or nightingale or bobolink can never compass.

In like manner, membership in a nation means a wider and fuller common consciousness, a consciousness of the same things held in common with tens of thousands or millions of people; and these things held in common thought are enriched by memories of

past national events, whether victories or sufferings, and inspired by common hopes of future greatness and accomplishment. The national anthem embodies the spirit of this common consciousness. Its appeal is equally immediate and intense upon any part of the nation; its evidence of the common consciousness, the consciousness of the same things held in common, is indisputable. What vivid and potent feelings are called up by some national battle hymn, what resources of will and sacrifice and ardent energy it taps, what depths of national consciousness and power it sounds.

There remains one step more. After families have grown to clans and tribes, tribes to nations and nations to empires, there still remains another collective consciousness to be reached: the august consciousness of the whole human race.

As human life has developed, new means have come into being, whereby wider and wider intercourse is made possible. On the one hand, railroads and steamships; on the other, international postage and telegraph lines, have made possible the daily and hourly interchange of thought throughout the whole human race; and this, just at the time when human powers of organisation make possible the stable maintenance of world-encircling empires. What happens in China or Calcutta or California is known throughout the world on the same day. Through our cablegrams, and the papers which print them, the whole world knows each day, at breakfast time, what has happened throughout the world during the last four and twenty hours. The mirth or misery of all mankind is thus shared by all mankind, day by day, and all the day. Very much in this is shallow, cheap, superficial, without doubt, yet the beginning of a great and magnificent reality is there already, and who can say what will be its consummation?

Thus, hurriedly and very imperfectly, we make our survey of history, flitting from one summit of human activity to another. Everywhere, we find the same great lesson going on, under a myriad disguises; the forging of a common human will; the moulding of a common consciousness, immense, vivid, all-embracing. And this, as we saw, with no sacrifice at all of individual will or individual consciousness, but rather with a superb enhancement of these. Were I alone in the desert, what scope would there be for my isolated will and consciousness, in any true and human sense? Every human being added to my range of action and knowledge adds a new field, new opportunities, through which I draw on wider resources within myself, calling more of my will and consciousness into action, and thus becoming more truly individual.

We can well see that those activities of the Will in the Soul which we explored before, namely the whole range of mental and

emotional life, minister most richly to this new realm of the Will in the Soul, the realm of interrelated wills and shared consciousness. How much of family unity depends on common memories, common thoughts, common beliefs; how much on the interplay of loves and hates, desires and fears, regrets and hopes, which make up our emotional life. And the same thing is true of the larger family, the wider group; clan life, tribal life, national life, and at last the life of all humanity, how much do memory and thought and feeling minister to these?

So, in human life, we begin to see certain ever-working, all-present powers, and aims and purposes of universal significance. The powers, whether of heart or mind, all rest on one power, the Will in the Soul; and this marvelous power is evoked by the implicit certainty, the intuition of the existence of other human souls. This has been the driving-power from the beginning of human life, operative equally in love and hate, through weal and woe. Through this, all loves and wars, all unions and contests have come about. It is omnipresent as air, beneficent and creative as sunshine.

This is the means. The end is not less universal and beneficent. It is the bringing of all human wills into relation with each other; the gathering together of the separate consciousness of all human beings, into larger realms of grouped consciousness; first, the family; then the clan and tribe; then the nation and empire; last, the whole human race.

Thus we find the master-hand present, miraculously operative through all human life, working through endlessly numerous free and separate wills and consciousnesses, to the aim of a united will and consciousness, wherein each shall be at once perfectly individual and universal, though united, yet altogether free.

What the content of this great consciousness seems destined to be, what shall be its depth, height, richness, beauty, power; and by what means these shall be brought to consummation, we shall in due course seek to discover.

CHARLES JOHNSTON.

(To be continued.)

VEGETARIANISM VERSUS CARNIVORISM.

IN taking up a subject of this nature there are so many things that deserve consideration, if we are in any way to do it justice, that it is best to start with the very first principles.

The happiness of one is intimately bound up with the happiness of all. Similarly as the rustling of a leaf as well as the rushing of a star alters the centre of gravity in the universe, so does the laugh or cry of a child, as well as the fiery embrace of suns add to or detract from the happiness of the entire cosmos. Every entity in the universe is indissolubly bound to and dependant upon every other entity. Every zephyr that blows, every star that twinkles, every day that breaks, every thought that forms, every smile that cheers, every sigh that saddens reaches in its infinite effects unto the uttermost that is and exerts an eternal influence on all that will be. Accept this and it is seen that our shallowest as well as our profoundest thought affects the welfare of the entire human race. The universe is a cosmic whole, an infinite Unity. Gods, men, brutes, flowers, atoms, are all of one family, are children of one generation, are sons of this Unity (that some call God), are indissolubly united by the closest bonds of relationship under one roof, in one home. Brutes are no more made for man's use than man is made for the use of brutes, but truly each is useful and necessary to all. Thus the mineral sustains the vegetable and animal world, and the vegetable, through sacrificing its form, sustains the animal, and animals prey upon each other. But the body of man is not required to sustain other beings, although other forms of life are required to sustain it.

It is in regard to this particular point that we are now concerned. We wish to discover, if possible, what forms of life it is most advisable for man to destroy in order to sustain his physical body in health. We believe that the happiness or unhappiness of one adds to or detracts from the happiness or unhappiness of all. From this we deduce a precept that is of the greatest importance: *live so as to cause the least pain to all sensitive creation*, or better expressed, *live so as to give all sensitive creation the greatest happiness*. It is with regard to this precept that we will consider the two systems of diet, the omniverous and the vegetarian. By vegetarianism, be it understood, is meant that diet that excludes all food

coming from the animal kingdom, but may include anything coming from the vegetable or mineral world.

In regarding the ethics of diet the first considerations must necessarily be physiological. Physiological considerations come first because, generally speaking, a healthy physical body is necessary if we are to live a happy life; though it is not impossible for an individual to be possessed of all the attributes prized by the wise, the chief of which is that felicity which is derived from within, even if he suffer all his days in the embrace of a malignant disease. Undoubtedly great lessons are to be learnt through suffering, but it is safe to say that he who possesses a perfectly healthy body is generally a happier man than he who is afflicted with disease.

Assume for a moment that the vegetarian diet is not hygienic and that in course of time will cause the physical powers to become gradually weaker. Carry this out to its ultimate conclusion and it is easily seen that if all men turned vegetarians the human race would soon become extinct. Surely no rational thinking man would approve of vegetarianism under such circumstances. If he found that carnivorism gave the health that vegetarianism failed to give, surely he would not refuse to eat flesh upon religious or metaphysical grounds. If it is said that the killing of an animal for food is not altruistic, then disease in man is not moral. There is a legitimate self-love. Self-preservation, that is to say health, is the primary, inborn instinct in every human being, and to go against it is to disobey Nature. Health, therefore, is the first thing to consider, and when it has been discovered how to live a healthy physical life then a sound foundation has been laid upon which we can build a healthy mental and moral character.

Considering civilized man, then, in his normal condition, where he can select for his diet all manner of flesh, fish and fowl, and all manner of nuts, fruits, grains, légumes, vegetables, let us endeavor to discover which of the two systems of diet that have been named should suit him best, from a physiological point of view.

It is generally accepted as a fact by Western nations that the eating of flesh, together with a liberal intercalation of food derived from the vegetable kingdom, is what is required to supply the proper nourishment to keep the body in health. But this opinion is accepted upon purely conventional grounds. It is doubtful, according to many investigators upon the subject, whether this diet is as satisfactory from the hygienic point of view as it is claimed to be. Many authorities are willing to attribute the prevalence of such diseases as cancer, tuberculosis, gout, rheumatism, to the eating of flesh-food.

Examining the various nations of the world it would appear

that those partaking of but little and no animal food are found not less strong, but if anything, more so, than those that are usually considered large meat-eating nations. To support this contention some eminent authorities can be quoted. Charles Darwin in his *Voyage of the Beagle* makes the following comment with reference to the Chilean miners: "The laboring class work very hard. They have little time allowed for their meals and during summer and winter they begin when it is light and leave off at dark. They are paid £1 sterling a month and their food is given them: this for breakfast consists of sixteen figs and two small loaves of bread; for dinner, boiled beans; for supper, broken roasted wheat grain. They scarcely ever taste meat." He also speaks of their bleak habitations among the mountains. Darwin was a man whose reputation as a scientist of the keenest and most accurate observation, was worldwide, and when he makes a statement that implies that the strongest men in the world are practically strict vegetarians, and that they live in a cold, exhilarating climate, it is, to say the least, significant.

Dr. Jules Grand, President of the Vegetarian Society of France, speaks of "the Indian runners of Mexico, who offer instances of wonderful endurance, and eat nothing but tortillas of maize, which they eat as they run along; the street porters of Algiers, Smyrna, Constantinople and Egypt, well known for their uncommon strength, and living on nothing but maize, rice, dates, figs, melons, beans and lentils. The Piedmontese workmen, thanks to whom the tunnelling of the Alps is due, feed on polenta (maize-broth). The peasant of the Asturias, like those of the Auvergne, scarcely eat anything except chick-peas and chestnuts . . . Statistics prove . . . that the most numerous portion of the population of the globe is vegetarian."

If we will but sweep aside prejudice we shall have very little distance to go to discover that the vegetarian régime is something decidedly superior to a fad. That the majority of the human race, either by choice or necessity, are vegetarians and that this majority includes the strongest and hardest working class, is significant enough, and we have not got to go to the Orient to get an illustration of the healthful effect of this diet upon a large class of people. In England, before the abolition of the Corn Laws, the food of the peasant was mainly bread and what vegetables he himself grew, and the hardy agriculturist of Scotland lived chiefly on oats, as Dr. Johnson significantly pointed out.

Turning our attention to what individuals have demonstrated, we cannot help but be impressed. Many instances might be cited showing without a doubt the evident athletic importance of the

vegetarian diet, perhaps the most notable being the Berlin International Walk (125 miles) on which occasion the first six arrivals were vegetarians. It might be mentioned that the outcome of a series of athletic tests recently carried out at Yale University, U. S. A., under Professor Fisher, furnish evidence that should convince even the most inveterate sceptic of the probable superiority of the vegetarian over the omniverous diet, when considered from the athletic point of view.

Scientists tell us that man is more nearly related, from an anatomical point of view, to the vegetable feeding ape than to any other species and it is reasonable to suppose he was originally formed a frugiverous animal. The taste of meat is one that does not naturally appeal to the palate and when eaten with relish it is only owing to an acquired taste. Notice the indifference of children for flesh foods and how greedily they partake of fruits, nuts, cakes and sweet-tasting things in general. This is significant, for children are unsophisticated and follow their natural instinct. It is only through being raised on the conventional diet that this primitive taste becomes debauched and they acquire a liking for savouries of all kinds.

Considering the effect of the vegetarian regimen upon the mind, we think it very much to be doubted whether the mentality of those nations largely vegetarian, such as the Chinese, Japanese and Indian, is in any way inferior to that of the great meat-eating nations of the West. The Chinese are courteous, law-abiding, quick-witted, economical, thrifty and wonderfully gifted with common-sense. They are renowned for their honesty, their reliability and their diligence. They possess an extensive literature, showing that they have penetrated deeply into the mysteries of science, religion and philosophy and, to say the best it were possible to say of any nation, they are probably one of the happiest nations that inhabit the earth.

As regards the Japanese, their demonstrations in international affairs during the past few years have been of such a nature as to lead one to believe they are entitled to recognition as a people of culture and deserving of esteem as one of the coming great world-powers. Their quick intelligence, versatility, good-health and true patriotism, all furnish evidence in favour of considering their intellectuality as nowise inferior to that of Western nations.

Mr. R. F. Johnson, in his book *From Peking to Mandalay*, writes of the Burmese in such a way that one could imagine he has discovered a heaven on earth. "Make a Burman a millionaire," he writes, "he will build pagodas, he will support the monasteries, he will entertain his friends lavishly, he will exercise a graceful charity unheard of in the West, and all these things he will go on doing

until his money-bags are so empty that he can carry them on his back with a light heart . . . he has discovered how to make life happy without selfishness and to combine an adequate power of hard work with a corresponding ability to enjoy himself gracefully . . . he is a philosopher and an artist."

Leaving the comparison of nations let us glance at individual testimony. We heartily endorse the sentiment of Thoreau, the transcendentalist, who said, "I believe that every man who has ever been earnest to preserve his higher or poetic faculties in the best condition has been particularly inclined to abstain from animal food." This sentiment is well supported by facts, for many of the greatest poets and philosophers have advocated and practiced abstinence from a flesh diet, among whom are Pythagoras, Plato, Seneca, Plutarch, Buddha, St. Francis of Assisi, Milton, Shelley, Sir Isaac Newton, Wesley, Swedenborg, Thoreau, Rousseau, Schopenhauer, Tolstoy.

All these things that have been roughly examined, should be sufficiently convincing to any rational thinking man, that anyway from the philosophical point of view, carnivorism is by no means as satisfactory as a non-flesh diet. But even if there are those who will not grant this much, at least no fair-minded person will deny that man can, if not live more healthily, at least live as healthily on a vegetarian as on an omnivorous diet. Let us assume, then, for the sake of those who will not go further than this, that both have, generally speaking equal hygienic value, and now let us consider the matter ethically and endeavor to discover which is the best from the moral point of view.

We will return to our maxim that we should live our lives so as to give the greatest amount of happiness to all sensitive creation. It is surely plain that the vegetarian is living his life more in accordance with this precept than he who adheres to a flesh diet, for the latter is an accomplice in the cruel treatment of animals and is certainly responsible for their death, although he himself does not actually handle the pole-axe. We are not yet quite omniscient it is true, but we cannot do otherwise than believe that we are causing far less pain in the sensitive world by eating kernels of wheat, than by the raising and slaughtering of cattle. Most people go through life without a pang of remorse or even thought of the pain they are accomplices in producing in the animal world. A man who has the power to feel sorrow for the suffering of an animal, surely will not continue to partake of flesh food when he realizes that he himself is helping to cause it. Let him watch the branding and emasculating of cattle; the herding and packing of the terrorized animals into freight cars; the privations of the journey; the

horrors that go on in a cattle boat; the final transportation to the house of blood, which as soon as they scent instinct informs them of their doom; the protracted agony of death dealt from an inexperienced hand; let him, let those who have any sympathetic feeling at all, become acquainted with these things.

It is not meant that we are not to act in self-defence, as has already been made plain in placing health as the first and most important point to consider. We must have wars and bloodshed when such are involved in a principle. It is not wrong to kill pests, nor is it wrong to kill thousands of human beings in a just war, but what is wrong is to give unnecessary pain.

St. Paul tells us to "think on whatsoever things are beautiful," now no one can gainsay that a corpse is an ugly object; yet millions of our fellows seem pleased enough to eat flesh that has quivered in pain, thus demanding thousands of people to gain their livelihood by handling dead animals. Perhaps a corpse is the ugliest thing in Nature: anyway Nature, who loves beauty, quickly absorbs it into earth and covers the spot with beautiful flowers. But man, barbaric man, has become so inured to the gruesome sight that he apparently sees no ugliness in it. Yet anyone possessing the faintest remnant of artistic refinement cannot fail to notice the difference in beauty between the sight presented by a collection of fruits, of apples, oranges, grapes, bananas, and that of an array of skinned carcasses.

It is owing to man's cruelty that the animals fly from his face, for the experience of their race has culminated in an instinct that informs them that man is their deadliest enemy. Darwin tells of the birds in the Galapagos Archipelago, that they were so tame, being unacquainted with man's insatiable thirst for blood, that they would perch on his shoulder, pick at his shoe laces and pick crumbs from his fingers. It is not long after man's appearance with his cruel weapons of slaughter that the birds learn that the very sound of his footstep is a warning to flee, to flee from the most powerful, brutal and bloodthirsty beast of prey that walks the earth!

It is granted that butchers as a class are callous, that butchering is degrading and stifles the sense of refinement. Who could imagine a beautiful and holy nature engaged in the occupation of a butcher? Now that which is moral is that which is beautiful, and as it is our present object to discover which diet appeals most strongly to our moral and artistic nature, we are led to ask how it is that men of probity can act as accomplices in producing that which is degrading and vile? What person of high spiritual ambitions, of Christlike sympathies, of artistic culture, can look without averted eyes upon the hideous sight shown in the butcher's

window, especially at the anniversary of the birthday of the gentle and compassionate "Teacher of Nazareth"? What person dare talk and sing of "Peace on Earth" while thousands of our fellowmen are slaying millions of terror-stricken, harmless, helpless, dumb animals? What person of true refinement can look without loathing and horror upon that gory blot that discolors the whole of our boasted civilization—the shambles?

These are plain straightforward words, unclothed with any sentiment of a foolish, false decorum. Would that there were no occasion to utter them! Let us do away with this frightful, deplorable massacre of helpless animals and thereby cleanse our civilization of one of the worst diseases to which it is a victim.

We have now shown the immense superiority of vegetarianism over omnivorism from the ethical point of view and having covered the ground as thoroughly as the brevity of space would permit, it only remains to point out what use we should make of the results we have obtained. How shall we conduct our lives so as to observe a proper relationship between ourselves and the animal world and at the same time discharge the obligatory duties that belong to our private, social and national life?

We must be consistent with our theories as far as the conditions in which we are placed will allow. If we were to go to the ultimate extreme we should not wear woolen clothes, nor felt hats, nor leather shoes, nor sit in leather chairs. We should not even attend a concert where music was produced by the aid of catgut, for the more demand, no matter how infinitesimally small, the more supply and we should perform no act that will or may create demand for that which to be obtained will cause pain in the animal world. He who would practise such sansculottism as this would have to resort to the severest seclusion, and as to whether this is advisable remains for the individual himself to determine. He has to choose between the ascetic life of an anchorite, who lives according to the letter of the law, and the ascetic life of the renunciant, who endeavors to live according to the spirit of the law. By staying amongst our fellows and proselytizing our views accordingly as we are talented we shall probably be doing more towards establishing the proper relation between man and brute than by turning cenobite and refusing all the social duties which we all are born more or less to discharge. Let us stay in the world and do what we can towards inaugurating such reforms as we think necessary. Let us protest for better conditions, and let the first step be to abstain from a flesh diet, for there is no reason why we should not procure what we need for sustenance from the vegetable kingdom. As for furs, feathers, seal-skins, we can surely

refrain from handling such articles. Under the prevailing conditions such an article as leather is a "by-product." Animals from whose skin leather is made, excepting horses, are slaughtered primarily for food. When they are slaughtered for their hides, then we must find a substitute for leather.

"However much thou art read in theory, if thou hast no practice thou art ignorant," says Sadi the Persian. Let us beware of that dangerous and subtle vice, procrastination. Never put off until to-morrow what requires doing to-day. Delay and *that* opportunity is gone forever. Never mind about the past; no time is sacred but the present and the present is always sacred. Because you have erred in the past, whether consciously or unconsciously, is no reason why you should do so in the present. It is never too late to be virtuous. The plea that the body has been accustomed for many years to one form of diet, and therefore any sweeping change, as from a diet containing a large percentage of meat to one containing none at all, would be detrimental to health, is not correct in the vast majority of cases, provided the change is made scientifically, and if there is a minority who would suffer by the change, no one can tell whether or not he belongs to it until he has made the experiment and found out, and if, when he has experimented and has found it gives unsatisfactory results, it depends upon his own individual perception of duty with regard to the abnormal circumstances of which he is the victim, as to what course he should pursue. Meat, like alcohol and opium, is a stimulant. But the eating of flesh has no such stimulative hold as the taking of alcohol or opium, although it certainly can be likened, in its effects, to these drugs, and therefore it may, similarly, in some particular cases be advisable to gradually abstain and not to make the complete change suddenly. Knowing, as we do, that the vegetarian diet is far the most hygienic in general, and realizing the enormous evidence in its favor from a moral point of view, it is not preposterous to persist, no matter how extraordinary the case may be, in an endeavour to get the system freed from the unnatural condition which an unnatural diet has created. De Quincey in his *Confessions of an Opium-Eater*, has described the fearful pains he suffered while breaking away from the pernicious habit into which he had fallen, and no one can do otherwise than admire his courageous, and, in the end, successful attempt. The slight inconvenience, so slight as to make the comparison with De Quincey's experience ridiculous, that some may suffer from a change of diet such as is here advocated, involves practically no risk of being otherwise than of a temporary nature, indeed, hardly deserves mentioning. But a point that certainly should be mentioned is that anyone accustomed to the

conventional meat diet, ought to study vegetarianism scientifically when converted to it. Going at it in a haphazard way may bring bad results, not because of the lack of meat, but because of the failure to apply the laws of hygiene. Probably many of the ills and ails common among meat-eaters originate through ignorance of the first principles of hygiene. The more artificial a life we lead, the more necessary it becomes to study diet scientifically.

There has always been opposition against the introduction of new ideas. Man seems to be conservative at heart. But the heterodoxy of to-day will be the orthodoxy of to-morrow. Every age has its heresies. Jesus was a heretic, a crank, a fool, an infidel, as judged by the conventionalism of his day. Do not get discouraged at the censure of those who have not yet climbed out of the valley of a foolish conventionalism into the purer air of higher knowledge, but rather help all your fellows by an extended tolerance and an exemplary life, to climb with you, to climb forward upon the road that leads to the goal that all aspiring beings desire to reach.

R. H. WHELDON.

"The unremitting retention of simple and high sentiments in obscure duties is hardening the character to that temper which will work with honour, if need be, in the tumult or on the scaffold."

R. W. EMERSON.

ON THE SCREEN OF TIME.

MYSTICISM AND RELIGION.

ALMOST there is nothing left for us to do, but *to be, to be*. Outer work of propaganda, of scholarship, of investigation, is being done so magnificently for us. From the mountains of God the inspiration pours forth. The world is flooded with its light and with its glory. In ways wholly unexpected, from quarters heretofore unknown, we find the radiance reflected and made plain.

At meetings of a branch of the Theosophical Society, we met and discussed the difference between mysticism true and false. It was shown that the true mysticism is not a passive condition, but, on the contrary, a fiery, active, positive aspiration of the will, rising to the inner and higher planes, turning within, in order to draw inspiration for action on all the planes where action may be needed. (Have you seen a charge of cavalry, with that leap of a thousand swords up into the sun?) And after that question had been settled, a book appeared, to be widely and favorably reviewed, entitled *The Mystical Element of Religion, as Studied in Saint Catherine of Genoa and her Friends*, by Baron Friedrich von Hügel, which demonstrates exactly the same point. As the *New York Times* reviewer explains it: the author recognizes fully that mysticism is not all of religion, and that if it claims to be such it becomes abnormal. Therefore he divides mysticism into two classes, a false, or "exclusive," mysticism, that leaves no room for other religious elements, and a true, or "inclusive," mysticism that recognizes the mystical element as only a part of the total religious life. In this latter sense Baron von Hügel maintains that mysticism as the immediate sense of union with God through withdrawal from the world, is not a peculiar faculty, but is a genuine part of a truly religious attitude. "Only thus does mysticism attain to its true, full dignity, which consists precisely in being not everything in any one soul, but something in every soul of man."

It is the movement away from the world toward God which should normally be balanced by the movement back from God to the world. If it is not so balanced it becomes "exclusive" and false. And yet as there is a true subdivision of spiritual labors, as of all kinds of work, it is of advantage that the mystical faculty should attain almost exclusive proportions in certain individuals. By that fact the whole life of the Church will be enlarged. "The primary and full Bride of

Christ never is nor can be any individual soul, but only this complete organism of all faithful souls throughout time and space." To that organism the mystical element in religion contributes one essential element.

Saint Catherine, who lived in the latter half of the fifteenth century, was not "a religious" in the technical sense. She was married and resided with her husband until his death. But because she withdrew interiorly from the world toward God, and carried back to the world great draughts of the divine elixir, she was recognized even in her life-time as a Saint, and was canonized afterwards by her Church in spite of tendencies which might easily have been regarded as heterodox.

This book is only one out of a score that might be named—modern books by modern authors, upon whose minds it has dawned that the lack of the mystical element in present-day Protestantism needs desperately to be supplied, and that Protestantism has become broad and liberal enough, for the first time in its career, to accept of truth even from sources which formerly were regarded as tainted. It was a good man and a true who asked, "Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?" And whether "Nazareth" in this case be Theosophy or Catholicism or Buddhism, there are men in the Protestant churches "in whom is no guile," and who are able to recognize truth from no matter what quarter it may reach them.

So is our work being done for us, by all whose hearts are open to the Light, for all whose eyes are not blinded by prejudice or self-complacency. Was it not said, years ago:

"It is not that you must rush madly or boldly out *to do, to do*. Do what you find to do. Desire ardently to do it; and even when you shall not have succeeded in carrying anything out but some small duties, some words of warning, your strong desire will strike like Vulcan upon other hearts in the world, and suddenly you will find that done which you had longed to be the doer of."

MISREPRESENTATIONS OF BUDDHISM.

In another department, also, our work is being done for us. Buddhism, even exoteric Buddhism, has been misrepresented for so long and so loudly, that it has seemed almost hopeless to correct the false impression made. Professor T. W. Rhys Davids, unquestionably the most prominent of Pāli scholars and the author of a treatise on Buddhism which, published first in 1877, had reached its "Fifteenth Thousand" in 1893 and its "Twentieth Thousand" in 1903, has come to be regarded popularly as the supreme authority on the subject. And Professor Rhys Davids does not understand Buddhism.

In the first place he insists upon treating the doctrine of Buddha as separate from the religion in which Buddha was brought up—the religion of the Upanishads; the fact being that Buddha was a reformer, an elucidator, an expounder of the wisdom which the Upanishads contain, and that his teaching, philosophically, simply anticipated the doctrine of Shankaracharya.

In the second place, Professor Davids, in his *Buddhism: Its History and Literature*, denies that in Buddhism any one of the five following principles of religion can be found: "The belief in a divine power, the acknowledgment of sin, the habit of prayer, the desire to offer sacrifice, and the hope of a future life" (footnote on p. 5). And he adds (p. 9) that the greatest achievement of Buddha was to ignore "the two theories of God and the soul."

The fact is that in each of the above respects, Professor Davids is mistaken. Buddha's doctrine regarding the soul was exactly the same as that of the Upanishads. Shankara explained it in his commentary on the *Vedanta Sutras* (quoted in the *Oriental Department Paper* of the Theosophical Society in America; No. 5 of 1896):

"The oneness of the soul with the Self is already a fact, and not a thing that requires a further effort to bring about; and therefore the recognition of the truth of the text 'That thou art' is sufficient to put an end to the personality of the soul, in the same way as the recognition of the piece of rope is sufficient to abolish the snake that fictitiously represents itself in place of the piece of rope. No sooner is the personality of the soul denied than the whole empirical habitual order of life disappears with it, to make up which the lower and plural manifestation of the Self falsely presents itself."

The Self *is*; the personality is an illusion. The reincarnating Ego relatively is real. Students of Theosophy know what that means: Professor Davids does not. It is his misfortune. But the books which he has translated might have helped him to understand it. There is this story in the *Mahavâgga*, translated by Davids jointly with Oldenberg:

At one time the Buddha was in a grove, and a number of young men were at play there, accompanied by some women. One of these women stole certain valuables and disappeared. So the young men went in search of her, and saw the Buddha sitting at the foot of a tree. They approached him, and said: "Pray, Lord, has the Blessed One seen a woman passing by?" To which he replied: "What have you to do, young men, with the woman?" They told him the reason of their search, and when they had done so he asked them:

"'Now what think you, young men? Which would be the better for you; that you should go in search of a woman, or that you

should go in search of yourselves?' " (*Sacred Books of the East*, vol. XIII, p. 117.)

To anyone at all acquainted with the religious thought of that period in India, Buddha's meaning is clear. And yet we are told that the Master repudiated the existence of the Soul!

Professor Davids also translated the *Tevigga Sutta*, in which we find the following:

"To the Tathâgata (Buddha), when asked touching the path which leads to the world of Brahmâ (the manifested Logos, or God), there can be neither doubt nor difficulty. For Brahmâ, I know, Vâsettha, and the world of Brahmâ, and the path which leadeth unto it. Yea, I know it even as one who has entered the Brahmâ world, and has been born within it!" (Ch. I, par 43, p. 186; vol. XI of the *Sacred Books of the East*.)

And again, in the same *Sutta* (Ch. III, paragraphs as numbered):

1. "And he lets his mind pervade one quarter of the world with thoughts of Love, and so the second, and so the third, and so the fourth. And thus the whole wide world, above, below, around, and everywhere, does he continue to pervade with heart of Love, far-reaching, grown great, and beyond measure.

2. 'Just Vâsettha, as a mighty trumpeter makes himself heard—and that without difficulty—in all the four directions; even so of all things, that have shape or life, there is not one that he passes by or leaves aside, but regards them all with mind set free, and deep-felt love.

'Verily this, Vâsettha, is the way to a state of union with Brahmâ.

3. 'And he lets his mind pervade one quarter of the world with thoughts of pity, sympathy, and equanimity, and so the second, and so the third, and so the fourth. And thus the whole wide world, above, below, around, and everywhere, does he continue to pervade with heart of pity, sympathy, and equanimity, far-reaching, grown great, and beyond measure.

4. 'Just, Vâsettha, as a mighty trumpeter makes himself heard—and that without difficulty—in all the four directions; even so of all things that have shape or life, there is not one that he passes by or leaves aside, but regards them all with mind set free, and deep-felt pity, sympathy, and equanimity.

'Verily this, Vâsettha, is the way to a state of union with Brahmâ.'

5. 'Now what think you, Vâsettha, will the Bhikkhu who lives thus be in possession of women and of wealth, or will he not?'

'He will not, Gotama!'

'Will he be full of anger, or free from anger?'

- 'He will be free from anger, Gotama!'
 'Will his mind be full of malice, or free from malice?'
 'Free from malice, Gotama!'
 'Will his mind be sinful, or pure?'
 'It will be pure, Gotama!'
 'Will he have self-mastery, or will he not?'
 'Surely he will, Gotama!'

6. 'Then you say, Vâsettha, that the Bhikkhu is free from household cares, and that Brahmâ is free from household cares. Is there then agreement and likeness between the Bhikkhu and Brahmâ?'

'There is, Gotama!'

7. 'Very good, Vâsettha. Then in sooth, Vâsettha, that the Bhikkhu who is free from household cares should after death, when the body is dissolved, become united with Brahmâ, who is the same—such a condition of things is every way possible!

8. 'And so you say, Vâsettha, that the Bhikkhu is free from anger, and free from malice, pure in mind, and master of himself; and that Brahmâ is free from anger, and free from malice, pure in mind, and master of himself. Then in sooth, Vâsettha, that the Bhikkhu who is free from anger, free from malice, pure in mind, and master of himself should after death, when the body is dissolved, become united with Brahmâ, who is the same—such a condition of things is every way possible!'

Then, as to a future life, Professor Davids does not seem entirely unbiased. In the *Dhamma-kakka-ppavattana-sutta*, translated by himself without the aid of Professor Oldenberg, he gives the teaching of Buddha (Par. 6) as to "the noble truth concerning suffering"—that the origin of suffering is "that thirst (or craving), causing the renewal of existence, accompanied by sensual delight, seeking satisfaction now here, now there—that is to say, the craving for the gratification of the passions or the craving for (a future) life or the craving for success (in this present life)."

But the translator injects the words in round brackets. He suggests in a note that the last two (in Pâli, *bhava-tanhâ* and *vibhava-tanhâ*) might also be translated "the lust of life, and the love of this present world." But he prefers the other translation—and the round brackets. Later, when translating the words in the *Vinaya Texts* with Oldenberg, he evidently found it impossible to retain the phrase, "craving for a future life," and substituted the words "thirst for existence," which, to the western mind, and to his own, conveys a very different idea.

Again, in his introduction to the *Ketokhila Sutta*, and giving its argument, Davids says it teaches "that zeal will be crippled in its struggle against bondage by sensuality, by sloth, or by a craving after a future life in any of its various forms."

This is quite misleading. Actually the *Sutta* (verses 20-24) warns against "the passion after lusts" (Kâme); against "the passion for a body" (Kâye); "for a form" (rûpe); for the ease of sleep and sloth, and, fifthly, against the desire to belong "to some one or other of the angel hosts" (*Aññataram deva-nikâyam*).

So with each of the five principles or aspects of religion which the Professor denies to Buddhism: each of them exists, and if space permitted it would be easy to multiply quotations under each head. No religion has carried prayer to greater heights than Buddhism, or has made sacrifice more essential. And when the professor goes further than this, and asserts that Buddhism is in no sense mystical or esoteric, he again errs, and shows further that the error exists very deeply within himself. For is there a mystic in this wide world, is there anyone who has so much as glimpsed the soul within himself, who would fail to recognize in these words from the *Sutta* entitled "The Great King of Glory" (Chap. I), an actual but profoundly mystical experience?

II. "In the first place, Ânanda, when the Great King of Glory, on the Sabbath day, on the day of the full moon, had purified himself, and had gone up into the upper story of his palace to keep the sacred day, there then appeared to him the heavenly Treasure of the Wheel (*Kakka-ratanam*), with its nave, its tire, and all its thousand spokes complete.' . . . 13. 'Then, Ânanda, the Great King of Glory, rose from his seat, and reverently uncovering from one shoulder his robe, he held in his left hand a pitcher, and with his right hand he sprinkled water up over the Wheel, as he said:

"Roll onward, O my Lord, the Wheel! O my Lord, go forth and overcome!'"

Or does this, from the same *Sutta* (Chap II), suggest materialism and a denial of the spiritual life?

3. "'Now the Great King of Glory, Ânanda, ascended up into the chamber of the Great Complex (*Mahâvyûhassa Kutâgârassa dvâre*); and when he had come there he stood at the door, and there he broke out into a cry of intense emotion:

"Stay here, O thoughts of lust!

"Stay here, O thoughts of ill-will!

"Stay here, O thoughts of hatred!

"Thus far only, O thoughts of lust!

"Thus far only, O thoughts of ill-will!

"Thus far only, O thoughts of hatred!"

4. "'And when, Ânanda, the Great King of Glory, had entered the chamber of the Great Complex, and had seated himself upon the couch of gold, having put away all passion and all unrighteousness, he entered into, and remained in, the First Ghâna—a state of joy and ease, born of seclusion, full of reflection, full of investigation.'"

After which there follows an account of the Great King of Glory's indrawal in prayer and meditation, from stage to stage of illumination, than which nothing could well be more mystical or more real.

"THE CREED OF BUDDHA."

These, and many other objections to the infallibility of Davids and some of his fellow-Orientalists, have been in the present writer's mind for years. He has longed to make such matters clear; for great and deep is the debt we owe to Sugatâ, the "Happy One"; great is the debt. Perhaps that longing, which was sincere, struck other hearts (and many must have shared it); for first came those earlier pages of *The Soul of a People*, by Mr. Fielding Hall, with their incomparably beautiful outline of the Master's life; then, by the same author, *The Inward Light* (which we still hope to review); and now *The Creed of Buddha*,* by an unknown author, which it is impossible to praise too highly and which disposes forever of the misinterpretations to which we have alluded. It is a masterly analysis of the blunders and contradictions into which the materialism of Orientalists has led them. But it is more than that. It is a brilliantly convincing statement of what Buddha really taught. We say this on the strength of nearly twenty years' acquaintance with Buddhist and other Eastern scriptures, which we studied in the light suggested by Madame Blavatsky, who was indisputably the greatest Oriental scholar of the last century.

It is impossible to summarize such a book, and difficult to quote passages from so coherent a whole. But this will show that the author has delved deep to the foundation of his subject: "The path of deliverance is the path of soul-growth." Simple enough; but if our Orientalists had discovered the same truth, they would not have needed revision. Again, on the subject of Nirvâna (and the conception of Davids is pathetic in its perversity): "Nirvâna is a state of ideal spiritual perfection, in which the soul, having completely detached itself—by the force of its own natural expansion—from what is individual, impermanent, and phenomenal, embraces and becomes one with the Universal, the Eternal, and the Real."

The last chapter of the book, entitled "Light from the East," is by no means the least interesting. The author declares his conviction "that the spiritual standpoints of the Sages of the Upanishads, of Buddha, and of Christ were, in the very last resort, identical," and that the ideas which Christ "expounded coincide, at every vital point, with ideas which were current in India many centuries before the Christian era." He suggests that this may be due to the close connection and intercourse between Western Asia and South-eastern Europe during the centuries which immediately preceded the birth of Christ. Such a suggestion may

*Published by John Lane Co., New York, at \$1.50 net. Postage 10 cents.

be the simplest for the majority of his readers to adopt; but has it occurred to him that a certain tradition which places Christ as an Initiate of the Egyptian Lodge, or rather, of the Egyptian branch of the Great Lodge, may be worth considering, and that Buddha and the Sages of the Upanishads may have drawn their knowledge directly from the same source? *Light on the Path* and *The Voice of the Silence* were not differently derived. The soul of each is the same, though the mind is not.

SOCIALISM IN CHINA.

In still another direction, the unseen wires of the world are being pulled in a way that will make our path clear for us.

That Socialism was tried experimentally and practically in China, some nine hundred years ago, was known only to a few students until the appearance of a popular contribution in the *Van Norden Magazine* of last September and October, by General Homer Lea, entitled "How Socialism Failed in China." Unfortunately, General Lea did not refer by chapter and verse to his authorities, and considerable doubt was expressed as to the correctness of his statements. It may be of service to students to know that the story of that period in Chinese history was told originally in the *T'ung Chien*, by the great historian Ssu Ma-kuang. A modern account, based upon that immense history, has been written by Chu-Ke Ju Chi, of the American Board, North China College, and is entitled *Chien Shih I Tu*. Information on the subject can be found in *The Middle Kingdom: Chinese Empire and Inhabitants*, 2 vols., by S. Wells Williams (see vol. II, p. 174); in *A Sketch of Chinese History*, 2 vols., by the Rev. Charles Guzloff; in *The Chinese Reader's Manual*, by W. F. Mayers, and in the *History of China*, 3 vols., by Demetrius C. Boulger (see vol. I, pp. 398-416). The facts, briefly stated, seem to have been as follows:

Chintsong the Second succeeded his father in A. D. 1067. China had been suffering from scarcity produced by want of rain. There was terrible poverty and suffering. Hanki, who had been Prime Minister during the two preceding reigns, was compelled to resign owing to the intrigues of his enemies. The Emperor asked him whether one of his rivals, Wanganchi by name, was a proper person to succeed him. Hanki replied that this man (who had had considerable experience in subordinate positions) might possibly be of service as the head of a college, but that he had not had the necessary experience for the highest office in the Empire. When Hanki was warned of the danger his candour entailed, he replied: "A faithful subject ought ever to serve his prince with all the zeal of which he is capable. Good or bad fortune depends on Heaven, and,

when we have done what we ought, should fear deter us and prevent us from continuing in the path of well-doing?"

Whether Chintsong appreciated Hanki's candour or not, he was evidently unimpressed by Hanki's advice, for he promptly called upon Wanganchi to become Prime Minister.

Wanganchi was an enthusiast. Some historians have doubted his sincerity; but there seems to be no need to do this. It is doubtful whether a dishonest man could have carried the people with him as he did for so considerable a time. He drew a glittering picture of the consequences which would flow from the reforms which he proposed. "The State," he declared, "should take the entire management of commerce, industry, and agriculture into its own hands, with the view of succouring the working classes and preventing their being ground to the dust by the rich." Capitalism was held responsible for all the ills from which China was suffering. And during his term of office, these views were carried into execution. The poor were to be exempt from taxation; land was allotted to them, and seed-corn was provided. Everyone was to have a sufficiency; there were to be no poor, and no over-rich. The masses expected that their favorite minister would confer on them the greatest benefits, and the least discomfort entailed by human existence. China was to be made ideally happy, because the people were to be given the essentials of happiness—which, according to Wanganchi, were "plenty and pleasure." The Emperor supported his Prime Minister enthusiastically, so the experiment was tried under the most favorable auspices possible.

And the result? Absolute failure, followed by disaster. Theoretically, the scheme should have proved successful, granted the Reformer's premises, namely, that man is a perfect machine, unbiassed by passion or sordid motives, and that "plenty and pleasure" will make him happy. Practically, in spite of the supervision of tribunals which were appointed to direct the operations of the peasant cultivators, it was discovered that men dislike protracted labor and will not perform it unless compelled by dire necessity. Ordinary human laziness, and the child-man's desire to see an immediate return for his efforts, resulted in an immense reduction, not only in output, but in the area cultivated. Further, owing to the carelessness of cultivation, the land became greatly impoverished. Wanganchi insisted that his views were right, and, in spite of failure, for long had a large majority of his countrymen at his back, as well as the loyal support of Chintsong. It was not until the year 1076, after his schemes had proved abortive beyond question, that he lost the sympathy of the public and finally of the Emperor.

Disaster followed not many years later. The character of the Chinese had deteriorated under Wanganchi's treatment—free land, free seed, and (for the poor) freedom from taxation; and the Tartars, always dangerous and threatening, found that resistance had become half-hearted and feeble. The Chinese troops were defeated, and failed to defend the crossing of the Hoangho, where a small body of determined men could have prevented the advance of a host.

The Tartar general exclaimed, when he failed to meet with opposition, that "there could not be a man left in China, for if two thousand men had defended the passage of this river, we should never have succeeded in crossing it." Wanganchi had emasculated his people.

Apart from the direct result, a curious side-light is thrown upon Socialistic tendencies by an incident which took place shortly after Wanganchi's disgrace. Chintsong had died. His mother had been appointed Regent or Empress Dowager. She at once sent for Ssu Ma-kuang, the historian, who was reputed to be a very wise man, and asked him what was the most important thing to be done. The sage answered: "The most important thing is to open the doors of speech." The Empress thereupon issued a proclamation allowing free speech. Free speech had not been allowed under Socialism.

Socialism and Bismarckian Imperialism, as Desmoulins pointed out in his *Superiority of the Anglo-Saxon Race*, are simply different aspects of one and the same heresy—that the individual exists for the benefit of the State. Both Socialism and Imperialism must necessarily be opposed to free speech. Conformity and co-operation by the legislative enactment of an Industrial Commonwealth, or by Imperial Decree: compulsion in either case; freedom in neither.

China learned her lesson dearly. We can learn it in the same way, by experiment and disaster: or we can accept the warning—and the Light which, in this case also, the East and its vast experience can throw upon our problems.

THE GROWTH OF THEOSOPHY.

A question, recently handed to us for reply, serves as a reminder that the *Screen* reflects the Theosophical movement within as well as without. We have escaped the glaring headlines of the past, and the unpleasant benefit of being "featured." Yet the movement exists more surely than ever before: and in no sense does it or can it stand still. First, however, for the question, which doubtless will be answered variously in the "Questions and Answers" department. It reads as follows: "Is there such a thing

as an accident or injustice? If so, in what way can we reconcile these statements with 'All is governed by law'? We come in contact with both statements in Theosophical literature."

Now it seems that this problem of justice, one solution of which was emphasized in the theosophical literature of the last century (and by myself in the present issue of the *QUARTERLY*), may be solved in another way, and to the satisfaction of those who may not be ready to accept the twin doctrines of Reincarnation and Karma.

The modern world has adopted an entirely wrong table of values. We regard health and wealth and personal comfort as things good in themselves, and in some sense as rewards for our virtues. But if we accept the statement that the universe exists for the purposes of soul, and that "good" and "evil" are terms which, properly used, can refer only to the life of the soul, we must necessarily admit that pain and the uttermost discomfort may serve us more truly, and be greater "goods," than experiences which, although pleasing to the personality, may drag the soul down. This subject was dealt with at some length in the reply to Mr. Garver's defence of Socialism in the January issue of the *QUARTERLY*.

Does this, or the adoption of any other "alternative," mean that we, as Theosophists, should forget, or should cease to proclaim, the great truths which have been entrusted to us? That, merely because people sometimes find Reincarnation unacceptable, we should abandon our ancient landmarks and give way before prejudice? It does not. It means that if we fill our souls with no other wish than to serve the Great Soul, we shall keep ourselves supple and ready to meet all comers on their own ground. To remain in a rut—is that our ideal of service? It was good to make strong breastworks; it is good to hold them still; but are we to cling to them like barnacles, or should we be prepared, after these many years of combat, to sally forth and to carry the war into the camp and into the strongholds of our enemy?

What is our aim? What are we fighting for? Is it to add a few more dogmas to the long catalogue which humanity has accumulated? Or is it by all and by any means to fight the darkness and to evoke the soul? Clearly it is that; and if the doctrine of reincarnation will serve our purpose best, then let us use it. But if, by proclaiming it, we are likely to produce no other result than a contraction or stiffening of the shell through which it is our business to pierce, then let us follow a line of less resistance and declare the truth of things, with equal truth, but in a different and more effective way.

Yet there are those who hold to their siege artillery when the word is to advance! More dangerous warfare, truly—at close range

now, with the danger every moment that we compromise with principle, and that we imperil the greater end for some immediate victory. That is the real danger: subtle and constant and difficult to avoid. But what can we expect? In the past, the dangers were flagged for us. To-day, because we, as a body, have advanced, our path is a hair-line—the path of all disciples.

Is it fear, then, that holds some back; or is it simply habit? It is not fear, because the greater danger is scarcely realized. And if it be habit, and lack of adaptability, there is only one hope for us—that is, to throw overboard every mental pre-conception and to open our hearts so that once more we may “draw on the breath of the great life throbbing in us all and let faith (which is unlearned knowledge) carry us through our life as a bird flies in the air—undoubtedly.” In no other way can we learn to move with the inner tides of the theosophical movement, and thus to “swing with the motions of the spheres.”

Brothers, there are glad tidings in the air. And some of us need glad tidings.

So many are tired—tired to the bone and almost to the heart. Repeated failures have made them tired. It seems as if they cannot succeed; as if they are not intended for success. What is left for them but to fall back into a walk, at best into a jog-trot, without hope of anything more than to keep pace with the majority? They saw the Vision—through a haze, it is true: and yet they knew it: they remembered and rejoiced and went forward with heart and soul aflame—years ago. Since then defeat after defeat and weariness upon weariness; until now they scarcely are conscious of the defeat that is.

But, brothers—there are glad tidings in the air. In spite of you and of myself, the heavens have been rent for us. The way is open which before was closed. It needs only a new and steadier effort *to be* the thing of which we dreamed; *to be* the fact we loved to fancy, that we may pass into our inheritance of light. The day is breaking and the shadows flee away. Greatly and literally is this true, and those who will may become messengers of the Master, to make straight His way and to share His peace.

T.

ELEMENTARY ARTICLES

VI.

THEOSOPHY AND SOME MODERN SOCIAL THEORIES.

IT is recorded of a great Teacher that when he saw the multitudes he had compassion on them, for they seemed as sheep without a shepherd. He spent hours in earnestly and patiently teaching them, and then he fed them.

The outcome was that they were determined to make him a King. In spite of his teaching they held on to the military theory of the Kingdom of Heaven. Their thought was that there would be plenty for all and an easy time: that their class would be freed from the Roman yoke, and the Romans would be brought under the yoke of their King. With a sad heart the teacher had to turn away from them and leave them to their dreams, trusting that his teaching, like good seed, would sometime bear fruit. This looks like a picture of twentieth century life, so near alike is human nature in the first century and now. We look out on human life with its strifes and contentions, its ambitions and struggles, its misery and wretchedness, its injustices and cruelties, and like the great Teacher we have compassion on the multitude and feel that something must be done to cure the ills and right the wrongs of the multitude. At first it seems as if the most urgent need is to feed their bodies and we do it. But we soon find that we have done little or nothing to solve the problem; we expected to create conditions that would be favorable to moral and spiritual welfare, but we seem to have done them an injury, for we have made them more selfish, and more clamorous for physical comforts and pleasures, while the moral and spiritual instincts have been dulled or silenced. All about us there are would-be-reformers with various theories, but nearly all agree that present conditions are nearly as bad as possible and ought to be destroyed. One is quite positive that if we would abolish private property in land and tax land values we could abolish all other taxes and at the same time abolish poverty and cure all the ills of our modern civilization. Another says no, that would not be enough,

the industrial conditions are all wrong. The workers create all the wealth but the capitalists cheat them out of it, we must get what belongs to us and give every man his rights, each one an equal share and an equal chance, and poverty and misery and crime will disappear and the world will be a paradise.

Another one says the great trouble is religion, the churches are all on the side of the capitalists, and are fooling you by promising something good after death. We know nothing about what comes after death, but we want our share of the good things of this life, give up your religion, leave the churches, take what is yours by right here and now, and you will be rid of your misery and poverty.

These and other similar theories seem plausible and certainly appeal to the multitude because the belief is well nigh universal that money is the one thing really worth having, and that material well-being is the supreme good. Whether the single tax would give us a larger income than all the other taxes give us or would provide only half as much, as one financial expert has figured it, I do not know; whether if all the wealth of the United States was equally divided we would all be rich, or as others say, we would all be poor, I do not know, but one thing must be clear to us all if we stop to think, and that is that any theory of economic reform based on selfishness can never offer a permanent solution of the problem. The system which embodies it will crumble before the attacks of a stronger selfishness, better equipped with brute force or intelligence. These various theories seem to agree in one thing, and that is that it is not necessary to make men and women any wiser, better, or nobler; all we have to do is to redistribute the wealth of the world so that everybody will have enough to eat and drink and wear—"a universal pasture with grass enough for all."

All these reformers seem to forget that present conditions are the results of evolution, the outcome of the working of the human race during past centuries, and so they imagine they can undo the work of the great law in some magical way. They forget that the social organism is governed by vital laws and is more than a machine. In one sense the problem of to-day is not a new one, it is the problem of man in relation to his fellow men. The substitution of mechanical power for muscular power at the beginning of the last century has made the problem a little more complex, and perhaps a little more acute. Before the introduction of steam power and the factory system each family was practically independent, growing its own food, making its own shoes and clothes, building its own home and making its own furniture. Now all this is changed. They tell me it takes sixty-four machines to make a

shoe, and each of the sixty-three operatives is dependent on the sixty-fourth for the finished product. And not only are the workers in one factory dependent on each other, but the different factories are dependent on each other. Strike out one and you paralyze the rest. In this way Providence is forcing on this generation the great problem of relationship,—the relations of men to their fellow men. A century ago the family was a little world, now the world is rapidly becoming one great family, and we are discovering that the words of Paul the Initiate are really true. "No man liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself."

We are discovering in practical life that the Theosophical teaching of human Brotherhood is the truth; our separate lives are parts of one great life, and the laws which govern it are not laws thrust upon it from the outside, but are vital, implanted in the organism itself. The physical body is a symbol of the body politic. We are told that our bodies are made up of numberless little cells and that each little cell has a life of its own. These little cells make up the different organs, and each organ has its own life and consciousness, yet is related to other parts and serves the whole organization—the law of service is fundamental. We are told, further, that each cell has the power of feeling, feeding, moving, and of reproducing its kind. We cannot work, or play, or laugh, or cry, or think without its costing the lives of these little cells, they are surrendered to the great whole. This is the law of sacrifice. We are also told that sometimes foreign cells get into the organism and refuse to obey this law of sacrifice. Then we have typhoid, diphtheria, small-pox, or some other disease. It is only while the living cells surrender themselves to the law of the body that we have life and health and power.

Now each individual is a cell in this great organism of society, and each of these cells has the power of feeding, feeling, moving and reproducing its kind. But each individual has also the power to obey or disobey the two great laws of service and sacrifice, and that is where the trouble comes in and we have social disease, restriction and fiction. If we can only induce each individual to obey these two laws—in other words realize and live the great law of Brotherhood—all our social ills would be cured in a short time.*

In the light of this teaching we see why so many of our modern social theories are failures. The Theosophical teaching seems to be the very opposite of these theories in many ways. Theosophy does not ignore man's social conditions and the rights and duties

* [Dr. Darlington, the chief of the Health Department of New York City, says that not a single one of the 186 laws regulating his Department would be necessary if citizens obeyed the Golden Rule.—Ed.]

of corporate life. On the contrary it has always laid emphasis on these, and if its teachings were universally adopted, would lead to a reorganization of society, and one that would give a wider diffusion of wealth and intelligence in the community. But one difference is that modern social theories put social conditions first, and maintain that happiness depends upon circumstances. Theosophy says the soul is supreme, that happiness depends on the character of the individual, and not upon circumstances, and so it attempts to make men better, believing that better men will make better homes and better circumstances generally. Some of these theories take it as granted that man's moral character depends entirely upon his condition, and that if you change his environment you will not only make him happier, but also a better man. Indeed, one of these teachers says boldly that "All men will be angels if you will take away the evils of their social condition." Theosophy assumes that the opposite is the truth—correct the evil in the individuals and social conditions will soon change for the better. Higher wages, better homes, and better clothing will come as the result of enlarged and ennobled manhood. Some of these theories are loud in the praise of freedom, brotherhood and peace, yet often in their manifestos there is bitter denunciation of the capitalist, and brotherhood means simply those who are members of their party—all outside are enemies to be destroyed. Some of these modern theories consider the individual of little value except as a cog in a great wheel. They propose to organize society on the plan of the great standing armies of the world, each one to have his place assigned to him and to do the work given him to do. His individual liberty of choice, of initiative, is to be taken away from him. This seems to be a great despotism, for there is hardly any despotism so absolute as that of a great army. Of course they claim that the hours of work will be shorter and the pay will be higher, but they do not say where the money is to come from to pay the workers. We have a great deal of graft to-day with the number of state officials we now have, and unless we can change human nature there will of necessity be far more when all are the servants of the state. Who would care to be President of the United States when there will be millions of men and women to be appointed to places? It is hard enough now with the present number of postmasters and custom officials to appoint.

Would it ever be possible to have a Luther, a Wesley, a Paul, or a Jesus under such a system? In proportion as the value and freedom of the individual has been emphasized has the world made progress in all that is noblest and best. The assertion of that value and the preservation of it has never isolated men and separated

them from interest in their fellows. On the contrary it has increased the interest of the individual in his fellows. While plenty to eat, plenty to drink and plenty to wear without moral and spiritual culture has made men more selfish, cruel and tyrannical, and so far separated them from their fellows. What John Morley says of the days of the Commonwealth and in reference to kinds of government is as true now as then: people will awake to the hard truth "that to turn a monarchy into a Commonwealth is not enough to turn the purgatory of our social life into a paradise." Nor is the attainment of what Schäffle calls the "quintessence of Socialism, its Alpha and Omega, viz., the transformation of private and competing capitals into a united, collective capital," a mere change in our economic methods, sufficient to right all wrongs and make us all good, kind and prosperous.

This does not mean that a Theosophist will not be interested in the present conditions of society, nor that he will abstain from efforts at social and industrial reform, nor that he will not admire the ideal which these various social theories set before them of the removal of the abuses that blight and curse the world to-day. He may refuse to commit himself to any of these schemes because he sees they are not only inadequate but hurtful. But if he really believes in the heart of Theosophy—Universal Brotherhood—he will look as Jesus did with compassion upon the multitude on the verge of submergence and will seek as best he can to uplift and bless them. He will co-operate wherever he can with those who are seeking to deepen and diffuse a sense of the common good, he will do his best to make men think not only of private weal and private wealth, but also of common weal and common wealth, for that is the law of Brotherhood.

He will be stimulated to this by the thought that he is himself partially responsible for present conditions. This is the law of Karma. We are here now in these present conditions because we have earned them. As we have sowed in past incarnations so we must reap in this, and here is our opportunity to work out our own salvation by striving wisely to work out the salvation of Society. This responsibility is resting upon us, and it is pleasant to remember that we have power and opportunity to serve, to help forward the evolution of the race. We need not get discouraged because the work is slow, we need not hurry, for the present condition of the world is the product of all the past, and that past as well as the present, has been and is under the direction of perfect Wisdom. If we fall in with some of these modern theories and address ourselves to the lower nature of man instead of the higher, our work will be largely lost because that will lessen life; and to cure its ills

more life is needed. Sin, that is, selfishness, thoughtlessness and love of money are at the root of most of our troubles in the social and economic world and our efforts must be directed to the curing, or taking away the causes. No true Theosophist can stand idly by, looking at present conditions and doing nothing to relieve them; the great laws of love, brotherhood, service and sacrifice urge him on to help. Service is the expression of brotherhood and is greater than the mere thought of it. If we are living the life we shall recognize as duty "what ought to be done because it is owed," for on that plane where all selves are One, activities are poured out for the use of all, and not for the gain of a separated self. And up toward that plane we must reach by a joyful self-surrender, a life of service and sacrifice. Only thus can we be helpers and saviors of the world; only as we are filled with compassion can we be bearers of light; only thus can we serve the good law, lift a part of the world's burden and hasten the evolution of the human race. Only thus can we bring summer into the hearts of men; only thus can we banish selfishness, poverty and wretchedness from the world and bring in health, wealth, peace and prosperity—the reign of Righteousness, Truth and Love.

JOHN SCHOFIELD.

"The disciple is able to endure all that he is called upon to endure. Wherefore do not evade, avoid, frustrate or force. But—ENDURE!"

"You sigh for the Angel of Deliverance. Be yourself your own deliverer."

"The star shines above the darkness. Fix your gaze on the star, and not on the dark."

BOOK OF ITEMS.



REVIEWS

Orthodoxy, by Gilbert K. Chesterton. Mr. Chesterton, in one of his essays, says that the last refuge of the tired reviewer is to call his work brilliant, so our pride prevents our using the exact word which describes his work. It has a glitter and sparkle and smartness which is best characterized by "brilliant." Mr. Chesterton writes in epigrams and paradoxes. We seldom find a paragraph of simple prose which conveys an idea in a direct manner. If he wants to say that we are a lazy people he goes about it in some such way as this. This is said to be an age of bustle and stir and rapid movement, of intense activity. But the direct contrary is the fact. We are a profoundly lazy and inert people and it is only the multiplication of motors and cabs and elevators which are used to pander to our ineradicable laziness and dislike for exertion which give the idea of our being active.

Apart from his style of writing and his constant effort to say clever and striking things, he has, in this book, written something which is distinctly worth while. It is a defence of orthodox Christianity along very novel and original lines. He takes up one point after another, about which people have quarreled since Christianity began, and, as in the case of our being lazy, he attempts to show by some more or less effective paradox that what we have objected to, or what was currently believed, was not the real meaning under the words used, or that the conclusion that really should be drawn was the direct opposite of that usually drawn. Hence a defense of that particular point. He defends Christian dogmas by showing that they do not mean what they are usually understood to mean. The results in many cases are quite startling, and in some cases quite unconvincing.

Among many other subjects which he touches upon, two are of special interest to us. He takes a fling or two at Theosophy and has quite a lot to say about Buddhism. We may perhaps claim to know something about Theosophy and a little about Buddhism, and it does not add to our confidence in Mr. Chesterton's other conclusions to see that in these two cases at any rate he utterly fails to understand either Theosophy or Buddhism and his points are therefore all based on incorrect premises, even if they are not absolute misstatements. He uses common, but entirely erroneous ideas about Buddhism, while he evidently does not really have any idea of what Theosophy is about. Indeed, we should judge from his entire point of view that he is quite incapable of ever understanding the Theosophical position. He is not a mystic, does not understand mysticism, and consequently misinterprets every phase of life which has a mystical significance. This is shown in a brief reference to the Quaker teaching of the Inner Light. He says with a cheapness that is not worthy of him that anyone who worships the Inner Light worships the Light within himself, or in other words himself. One would have supposed that the testimony and lives of many generations of

Quakers would have demonstrated to Mr. Chesterton the absurdity of such a statement.

Another minor point which interested us is that he twice calls Theosophy *supercilious*. We wonder just what he means by that and whether as a whole it is a fair charge. We have found from experience that we take a wider and more comprehensive view of life than others. This must show in our manner and our speech, but does it justify our being called supercilious? Is it not another case where he has been unable to distinguish between a manner of speech and the reality which lies behind it? The book is interesting and worth reading.

C. A. G., JR.

The Problems of To-day, by Andrew Carnegie. Mr. Carnegie has performed a service of real value to the community in the writing of this book. As might perhaps be suspected from the title, it is a discussion of Socialism, and the more important economic and political questions involved are presented with admirable clearness and simplicity. Indeed, some phases of the subject are put forward in this book with a greater directness and lucidity than we can remember seeing anywhere else.

Mr. Carnegie does not pretend to do more than suggest certain conclusions which seem to him to be the inevitable corollary of the Socialistic scheme; he would be the first to deny that his little book was a comprehensive discussion of the subject. But he does unmistakably put his finger on the essential points, quotes from recognized socialistic writers for his premises, and then quietly points out certain inevitable conclusions. For instance, he does what the Socialists hate; he proves from their own writings that they themselves do not yet know what they want. In the matter of compensation under the communistic regime he shows that one school of socialistic writers advocates equal compensation to all regardless of the nature and value of the service performed, and that another school, knowing that to be impossible, denies that socialism teaches it and boldly advocates compensation relative to the quality and quantity of service to the state.

Mr. Carnegie cleverly shows this divergence to be of great importance, indeed, almost fundamental, for if the former position is advocated, it could not possibly work, while if the second position is adopted, it ceases to be socialism. He makes a similar analysis of many other socialistic theories, with equally definitive results.

A valuable part of the book is where he points out that most of the reforms which Socialism has adopted and labelled "Socialism" were long ago started and partly enforced by our present individualistic system. He shows with clearness and convincing logic the old fallacy started by Adam Smith, that capital is the product of labor; the fallacy upon which Marx builds his whole social system, and without which it falls completely to the ground. He shows that capital is the product of *labor, capital and ability*, and that no one has yet succeeded in showing which of the three elements performs the most valuable service and should receive the greatest compensation.

As is already well known, Mr. Carnegie is a strong advocate of a progressive inheritance tax, which, in the case of fortunes over five million dollars, he would make as high as fifty per cent. It is, however, impossible even to mention many of the admirable "points" which he makes and which add so much to the value of the book. We commend it to all our readers, particularly to those whose warm hearts and sympathetic ideals lead them towards socialistic heresies.

C. A. G., JR.

The Perfect Way; or, The Finding of Christ, by Anna Kingsford and Edward Maitland, has been republished in popular form by John M. Watkins, 21 Cecil Court, Charing Cross Road, London, England, at the astonishingly low price of one shilling or 25 cents net. The book contains 376 well-printed pages, and does the publisher immense credit. It is a book that deserves to be read and studied. Dr. Anna Kingsford was a great woman, a sincere mystic. She would have been much greater if she had been less of a woman and more of a mystic. She was unable to recognize in another woman a soul of much greater attainments than her own. She did not support Madame Blavatsky as she might and should have done. This is ancient history, because Dr. Kingsford died twenty years ago, and the trouble in the old London Lodge long antedated that; so we can learn impersonally from the facts. Dr. Kingsford wanted to make the Theosophical Society in England a Christian body. Madame Blavatsky, and those who worked with her and advised her, insisted that it must remain unsectarian. Both Dr. Kingsford and Edward Maitland resigned and formed a Hermetic Society which expired in less than two years. The moral is, as Mazzini pointed out as the result of long experience in a very different field, that "next to the capacity of rightly leading, the greatest merit consists in knowing how and when to follow."

T.

Steps Along the Path, by Katharine H. Newcomb (Lothrop, Lee & Shepard Co., Boston), is redundant with a rather superior optimism. That is, there is less of bare-faced "healing" in it than there is in most books of its class. The lady speaks of her "patients and pupils," from which we infer that she will not object to being described as a professional optimist. None the less, the treatment should prove much more efficacious for neurasthenics and for sufferers from dysæmia than drugs, and certainly less harmful; for she does not use suggestion (at least, not in these *Steps*), and contents herself with advising the cultivation of a positive will and active serenity.

T.

The Common-Sense Bible Teacher, a "Medium for Conducting a Bible Class on Evolutionary Principles," is published monthly, as a magazine, by C. L. Abbott, 242 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn., a single copy costing 25 cents. Its teaching is distinctly rationalistic, in the mid-Victorian sense, and the authorities quoted are in many cases out of date. But a translation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, although occasionally much too slangy, is uncommonly well and vigorously done.

T.

Breaking the Fetters; or, The Truth About the "Church," is a pamphlet by Dr. Henry Hensoldt, published by the author at Sydney, Australia. Dr. Hensoldt must be the same gentleman who formerly lectured about Thibet and the experiences which he wished he had had there. In this pamphlet he attacks the church, and for fear that he should be accused of partiality, explains that "whether against his unsavory 'Saintliness' the Metropolitan of Moscow, who presides over the 'holy' (and greasy) Russian Synod, the astute charlatan who masquerades as Archbishop of Canterbury, or the amusing old trickster in the Vatican," he has "the same respect for all, viz., *absolutely none*," which, we trust, is enough said.

T.

MAGAZINE LITERATURE.

The Open Court for January devotes much space to the Holm-Nestorian Expedition of 1907, and to the original text of the Nestorian Tablet. The February issue contains an article on Peshawur, which is said to stand on the site of

the ancient Buddhist city of Gaudhara. The article is well illustrated. Quite the most attractive feature for March is "The Wooing of the Moon-Maiden; a Fairy Tale of Old Japan," by Mr. Charles Johnston. It is a charming story, charmingly told, which should have a ready sale if reprinted as an allegory of death—of death in the sense of an awakening "from the dream of life." But before it is reprinted, those who are acquainted with Mr. Johnston's writings may be glad to obtain a copy of the March issue (Vol. XXIII, No. 634), from the Open Court Publishing Co., P. O. Drawer F, Chicago, for 12 cents, including postage. It is most well worth preserving as well as reading. An article by the editor on "Christianity as the Pleroma" (to be continued) quotes the statement of St. Augustine that "The very thing which now is called the Christian religion existed among the ancients, nor was it absent in the beginning of the human race before Christ came into the flesh, since when the true religion which already existed began to be called Christian."

E. T. H.

The Monist for January, 1909, specializes once more on the subject of Pragmatism. The editor finds entertainment in following Professor Stein into a supposed "unmistakable kinship between Schopenhauer, Nietzsche and (Wm.) James," than which nothing, in our opinion, could be more far-fetched or meaningless. The number is not up to the *Monist's* usual standard

X.

The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods, Nos. 1 to 4, provides several interesting reviews, among others, a notice of the recent *Études d'histoire et de psychologie du mysticisme*, by Henri Delacroix. The original articles are exceedingly technical, which is, of course, just what they are supposed to be.

Theosophisches Leben, for January and February, contains either translated or original articles by Dr. Keightley, Charles Johnston, Paul Raatz, F. Schwab, Sandor Weiss, E. J. Wiederhold, "Lige," Peter Prosegger, Ekis Igriega, "Cavé" and others. They are interesting numbers and cover a wide range of theosophical subjects. As usual, the appearance of the magazine is excellent. Copies can be obtained by writing to Paul Raatz, Sekretär der "T. G. in D.," Berlin, S. W. 48, Wilhelm Str. 120. There must be many Germans in America who would like to subscribe regularly for this valuable little magazine.

T.

Neue Metaphysische Rundschau for November-December changes and rather improves its cover. The best articles are contributed by the editor himself, Paul Zillman.

T.

We have also received *Sonnenstrahlen für die Jugend* for December-January; *Neue Lotusblüten* for January-February; *The Herald of the Cross*; *Shafts*; *The Bar of Isis, or The Law of the Mother*, by Frances Swiney; and *The Light of Reason*.

THE PARABLES OF THE KINGDOM, by Charles Johnston, with cover-design by Birger Ekwing, will be ready by May 1. The price will be 30 cents a copy.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

QUESTION 96.—*What do you understand that Jesus meant when He said: "Follow Me; and let the dead bury their dead"?*

ANSWER.—Let us compare these words of Jesus with other of his sayings:

"He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me." (*Matt.*, 10:37.)

"If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." (*Luke*, 14:26.)

And in the familiar story of Martha and Mary, which has been a stumbling block to generations of Christians, we read: "Martha, Martha, thou art careful and troubled about many things: But one thing is needful: and Mary hath chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her." (*Luke*, 10:41-42.)

"Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you." (*Matt.*, 6:33.)

"Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a merchant man, seeking goodly pearls: who, when he had found one pearl of great price, went and sold all that he had, and bought it." (*Matt.*, 13:45-46.)

Is not the question one merely of relative values? And is not the answer of Jesus clear and emphatic?

"Neither shall they say, Lo here! or, lo there! for behold, the kingdom of God is within you." (*Luke*, 17:21.)

L. E. P.

ANSWER.—A disciple asked leave to go and bury his father before following after Jesus. "But Jesus said unto him, 'Follow Me; and let the dead bury their dead.'" (*Matt.*, 8:22.)

What could this mean except that to those who have not been awakened spiritually, should be left the material cares of life? Let those who are troubled by the promptings of the spirit provide for the necessities of the body, after following the call of the Divine voice, but not before.

K. H.

ANSWER.—Jesus used the expression "dead" when referring to those who are not "alive"; and to be alive means to be conscious of the soul as the real self. "Being dead in your sins," as St. Paul speaks of it in one place; or, in the Epistle to Timothy—"But she that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth." It is of the utmost significance that the Greek word used by St. Paul for "mortal," as in *Rom.* vi, 12; viii, 11; *I Cor.* xv, 53, 54 ("your mortal bodies") is *thnētos*, which may also be translated "dying" or "deadened"; and that the Greek word he uses for "dead," in the passage quoted above from Timothy, is *thnēskō*, to die—from the same root. St. John also uses *thnēskō* for "dead" in the story of Lazarus. It seems, therefore, that what Jesus meant when he said, "Let the dead bury their dead," was that those who were not yet alive, in the true sense, could well fulfil

the task of burying a dead body, while his disciple, who was coming to birth, should follow Him and do the work of the Spirit. It was doubtless a lesson intended primarily for that disciple. T.

ANSWER.—In so far as I am able to see, He meant exactly what He said. In those who followed Him there was a possibility of life—eternal life. Those who refused to follow Him, or merely were not able as yet to follow Him, were dead in relation to life eternal. V. J.

QUESTION 97.—*Is not the Christ of the Twentieth Century as powerful to heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, and cast out devils as Jesus was in the First Century?*

ANSWER.—Yes; and from one point of view so much more powerful that He has other and more important and more difficult work to do. It is possible that He is trying to raise us from the dead. May God give Him victory in that as in all things! X.

ANSWER.—He certainly is, possibly a little more, for man, on the whole, has grown a little more responsive. As to the faculties of a living Christ, centuries do not make any change in them. V. J.

QUESTION 98.—*Is there anything positive about mysticism? It seems to me to be a blending of dreaminess and renunciation, essentially a woman's religion; not one which can inspire a man to strong constructive activity.*

ANSWER.—Mysticism, properly so-called, signified, in the first place, the closing of all the avenues of perception by the senses, and thus withdrawing the mind from external distractions, and enabling it to receive direct illumination from the Divine Spirit within us. There is no sex in religion, and no reason why mysticism, a very spiritual form of religion, should be branded as "a woman's religion." It is *not* one which can inspire a man to strong constructive ability because that has nothing to do with religion, but is purely an intellectual faculty. K. H.

ANSWER.—We are told in *Light on the Path* that the first two rules in the making of a mystic necessitate the use of the surgeon's knife. If this operation is performed by life or by the direct initiative of an expert physician it may be negative, if by the patient himself it is very far from being negative. The latter half of the process is essentially positive and constructive.

Compare this simile regarding death from the Brihad Aranyaka Upanishad (*Song of Life*). "Then, as a caterpillar, when it comes to the end of a leaf, reaching forth to another foothold, draws itself over to it, so the soul, leaving the body, and putting off unwisdom, reaching another foothold there, draws itself over to it." Work done from the latter foothold, the higher plane, is distinguished from that done from the lower plane in that it is not done from motives of selfishness with some form of self-interest as end, but disinterestedly in the service of humanity and of the spirit.

This latter stage of mysticism, which is the beginning of true mysticism, when the soul has been born and begins its conscious life, has two aspects. They are given us in the familiar summary of the Commandments: "Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind," and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." These have been called the intensive and social aspects of Christianity and contain the whole duty of the mystic.

Conscious communion with God is the result of the positive and dynamic

power of love and of purity, and the permanence of that vision of God which we are to work into the very fabric of our lives is dependent on the sincerity and persistence of our attempt to live up to each individual gleam of light as we receive it. There is, therefore, a continually expanding circle in the life of the mystic: The ideal works itself out in action; the life in turn enables him to test, strengthen, and enlarge the ideal.

And from the Gita: "Not by withholding from works does a man reach freedom from works, nor through renunciation alone does he win supreme success. He who restraining the powers of action, dwells, remembering in mind the objects of sense, such a one, wholly deluded, is called a false ascetic." "Thy right is to the work, but never to its fruits; let not the fruit of thy work be thy motive, nor take refuge in abstinence from works. Standing in union with the soul carry out thy work, putting away attachment."

To conclude: He who loses his life that he may save it is negative when viewed solely from the standpoint of his loss, but positive when viewed from the standpoint of his gain. Can there be a doubt in the mind of any mystic as to which is the real standpoint?
L. E. P.

QUESTION 99.—*How is it possible to reconcile the theory of reincarnation with the pretty well established fact that mental and moral inheritance counts for something?*

ANSWER.—Heredity is one factor in reincarnation and certainly counts for something. According to the *Secret Doctrine* there are *seven* factors concerned in the origin of species, variation transmitted by heredity being the first. Then comes natural selection, sexual selection, isolation, correlation of growth, and adaptation to environment. (Intelligent as opposed to mechanical causation.) *cf. Vol. II, 738.* This concerns the physical, but mental and moral heredity proceed on similar lines.
K. H.

ANSWER.—Heredity is part of the machinery of reincarnation. It is one of the means by which the reincarnating Ego is provided with a physical instrument suited to its needs. Indeed looked at broadly, as what enters into a man from his parents, heredity goes far deeper than the physical, and might be regarded as including the moral and mental training and character building that his parents give him in childhood, quite as much as the building of his body in the prenatal state. In each case what is drawn from the parent is but material, which is received in part and in part rejected. If we remember that it is not by chance that a soul is drawn to this or that environment, but that it is the action of choice and law, then it is impossible to consider the medium through which the law works as needing reconciliation with the law itself.

This relation between reincarnation and heredity is outlined in the sixth book of the Bhagavad Gita, where Krishna answers Arjuna's question as to the fate of those, who, seeking union with the Supreme Spirit, fail to reach their goal in a single life. Krishna says:

"Entering the worlds won by holy deeds, and dwelling for long ages there, he who fell short of union is reborn in the house of pure and holy folk;

"Or, indeed, he may be born in a family of seekers for union, full of wisdom, for such a birth in this world is harder to obtain.

"There he possesses the same soul-vision that he won in the former body, and therefore strives again for the perfect attainment, O rejoicer of the Kurus.

"Even without any wish of his own, he is taken in hand by his former effort."
H. B. M.

QUESTION 100.—*Why is it that some people are filled with the spirit of God and others are not? What makes the difference?*

ANSWER.—It is never easy to answer the questions that begin with "why," for causes lie wrapped in their effects and it is hard enough to learn the "how" of life. Yet if we patiently study the facts, and observe the processes which daily take place within ourselves, they will yield up their secret; and from our knowledge of how facts arise we can tell something of the reason for their existence. When, in instance after instance, we see that we grow into the likeness of our desires, that the "soul is dyed by the thoughts," and that our character is built from our habitual thoughts and strivings, then it becomes evident that the reason for the present existence of any attribute or quality must lie in the nature of our past efforts and aspirations. If we would be filled with the spirit of God we must love God, we must think God-like thoughts, and desire divine desires; then our love and thought and desire will draw into us that which we love and mold us into its likeness. This is the law we see all around us, it is how we change from what we were into what we will be, and in it lies the answer to the present question; Those who are filled with the spirit of God are those who have loved God. This is the answer made to us by familiar fact, and it is also the answer made by Christ when he told his disciples, "If a man love Me he will keep My words; and My Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him."

"What makes the difference?" It is the difference between day and night, the difference between a soul in which there is light and one in darkness. Or it is the difference between life and death, between that which is dynamic and that which is inert. We could perhaps liken the power of the spiritual world to that of a great magnet whose field covered the whole of human life, but which could only draw or affect that which was of its own kind, which was itself magnetic. If we have in us no love for the things of the spirit then we are as wood or stone, inert and unresponsive, however strong the field. But as an inert coil of wire may be made responsive and magnetic by the passage of an electric current, so our inert hearts are quickened and made responsive by our love and aspiration. And according to our love, so is the help that may be given us, not because help is withheld, but because without love we cannot respond to the force poured forth. Thus it is that if we cannot find the spirit of God within us it is quite useless to look for it elsewhere, for the measure of the spirit within our own hearts is the measure of the power of the Infinite Spirit to move and lift us, or to make us aware of the richness of its fruits.

H. B. M.

ANSWER.—This question may be answered in part by the answer to Question 99. We are told in the *Secret Doctrine* that the dawn of this cycle of evolution found matter in seven different conditions, ready to act as vehicle to seven types of beings, and from the deviations of these primeval entities, started the chain of causation that makes the differences in men to-day.

K. H.

QUESTION 101.—*Is there such a thing as an accident or injustice? If so, in what way can we reconcile these statements with "All is governed by law"? We come in contact with both statements in theosophical literature.*

ANSWER.—It would have been better to give references to these statements in theosophical literature. Their context should explain them.

There is no such thing as an injustice, if our vision extends over a sufficient range of time. The effect is contained within the cause, and thus comes

into existence, potentially, at the same moment as the cause; but years or ages may pass before the effect is born or worked out on the material plane. Karma, the law of equilibrium, the action of which is conscious and purposive—means that whatever we sow, we shall reap; and that whatever we reap, we have sown. It does not mean that we must necessarily have sown in this life that which we are now reaping. The sowing may have been done in a previous existence. Hence, judged as affecting the present personality only, and in the terminology preferred by some exponents of Theosophy—that personality may suffer *or may enjoy* undeservedly. (Had we, as infants, earned the advantages with which ages of experience surrounded us?) From that standpoint it is added that in the after-death states, before the fading out of the personality as such, the equilibrium is restored; and that in Devachan, during the sleep of the soul's body between two lives on earth, the higher aspirations of the preceding personality are realized and enjoyed on that plane.

A moment's thought, however, will show that it is equally correct to say that even the personality only *seems* to reap undeservedly. It depends from which angle we approach the question. Further, the personality being merely "a purgation" of the soul, as the early Christian Gnostics so luminously phrased it, the exact balancing of things, as affecting any one personality, is in fact a matter of small consequence. T.

ANSWER.—There is no injustice. And belief in accidents is a sign of slipshodness in the processes of thought. If there were the stars would fall off their orbits, for cosmic equilibrium is but a manifestation of justice. Were there the slightest fault in the working of justice, the whole fabric of life would instantly crumble to pieces. Could billions be piled upon billions if one plus one were not two? When a child fails to obtain the correct sum, are the rules of mathematics at fault? And in the tangle of human life injustice is but the best justice that can be obtained under the circumstances. We shall have to do our sums over and over again, until the result is quite correct. Then the theosophical literature also will become quite consistent. V. J.

QUESTION 102.—*According to Theosophy, when does reincarnation take place? Do you believe it possible to remember incidents of this life? And if we have another life in the flesh, we will have a brain, and if a brain, why not memory?*

ANSWER.—Assuming that you have no acquaintance with Theosophical beliefs and are asking for information, not mere curiosity, nor for the purpose of putting puzzling questions, I will endeavor to make my answer plain, by going back of your question instead of beginning with it. This only for the sake of clearness and enabling you to understand fully the reply. If you have no knowledge of Theosophy, as I assume, it is necessary. If you have a knowledge, statement of the facts, though perhaps a trifle tedious, will do no harm.

Karma is the result of the operation of the great Law of Compensation, "As ye sow, so shall ye reap." Karma began with the first incarnation and will only end when the "Higher Self" is again in unity with the infinite. The persisting Ego is the real man. The man as we see him is only the tenement of the real man within. The Ego is immortal, indestructible, was with the Infinite in the beginning, has existed ever since, and will always exist, a ray from the Infinite, and as eternal as the source from which he sprang, and to which he will inevitably return.

Karma is not a blind fate, of which man is the victim and from which he cannot escape. In each life the Ego builds for the next life, governed to a

certain extent by his former incarnation, but with a wide latitude as to how he shall build for the next. As he builds well or ill, so will he be punished or rewarded in future lives. Though governed by Karma, he is the creator of his own Karma. Karma is one of the great factors in determining the time of rebirth. Karma is the one great factor in determining the circumstances, place and environment of the rebirth. The time of reincarnation is when the Ego is found ready for it. The Ego belongs to Eternity, not to time. Time is to Eternity as the shadows of yesterday to the meridian sun of to-day. The shadows pass, the sun remains.

To the second portion of your question, personally, I believe that the Ego has a memory of what has gone before, but the brain of the physical man, the tenement in which the Ego temporarily dwells, has no such memory. Yet at rare moments the Ego does impress its memory on the brain of the physical man. How often have all of us had experiences that seemed a mere revival of memory instead of a gain of knowledge. Our intuitions are often flashes from the jewels of experience, stored in the memory of the Ego in its former existence.

To your third question: Yes, when (not if) we have another life, or reincarnation, the physical man will have a brain, and will also have a memory, but the physical brain and memory perish with the physical man, of which they form a part. They answer a temporary purpose. They are mainly for the use and protection of the physical man in this existence. They are vehicles for the manifestation of the Ego, but they perish as the muscle perishes, as the flesh perishes. Each incarnation is but a roadside inn on the great highway, traversed by the Ego in its long journey from its first incarnation to its final union with the Infinite.

W. H. L.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

The next Annual Convention of the Theosophical Society will be held on Saturday, April 24, 1909, at the Brevoort Hotel, Fifth Avenue and Eighth Street, New York City, beginning at ten o'clock. All Branches are requested to send delegates or designate proxies to represent them. Branches unable to send delegates may forward their proxies to the Chairman of the Executive Committee, Mr. Charles Johnston, to the Treasurer, Mr. H. B. Mitchell, or to the Secretary, Mrs. Ada Gregg, 159 Warren Street, Brooklyn, New York.

CHARLES JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Executive Committee.

BP The Theosophical quarterly
500
T46
v.6

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

